REDSO/ESA

FY2000 RESULTS REVIEW AND RESOURCES REQUEST

April 1998

Note:

Non-text files (e.g., spreadsheets, charts, maps, etc.) have been appended at the end of the document

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PART I.   OVERVIEW AND FACTORS AFFECTING PROGRAM PERFORMANCE

The Development Context

A wide-ranging African economic and democratic renaissance has been taking place over the past decade. Despite a lack of international interest, this positive trend was given formal recognition by the March 1997, President Clinton visit to the continent. Overall development trends in the majority of African countries, negative events in a Somalia and Burundi notwithstanding, are positive and demonstrate the African people's increasingly impatient desire for a better life. There is also **a new realism and pragmatism on the part of African leaders** to make the changes necessary to support economic growth and democratic governance.

One important emerging trend in Africa is regionalism. In contrast to the failures of the not-so-recent past, regionalism and African regional institutions are becoming the driving forces behind what Salih Booker terms this "fragile African renaissance." The **new wave of African leaders understand** that internal political stability and sustained economic growth are dependent on, and often controlled by events taking place in neighboring countries. The new leaders want to break the traditional dependency cycle of foreign assistance and increase trade and private investment to support economic growth.

This past year, therefore, has been a watershed year for **regionalism and regional partnerships in Africa**. USAID can take special pride in the regional value-adding activities from the Regional Economic Development and Services Office for East and Southern Africa (REDSO/ESA). Over the past year REDSO/ESA has helped identify and revitalize a series of key African regional-institutional actors in the policy and technical services areas; has changed the regional policy environment for the good; and has positioned African countries to better participate and take advantage of global economic trends. These ongoing efforts are being deepened and expanded by two important Presidential Initiatives: the Greater Horn of Africa Initiative (GHAI), whose USAID strategy component was approved in November 1997, and the African Growth and Opportunity Act of 1998 just approved by the House of Representatives.

In Uganda, the regional summit of African leaders with President Clinton called for removal of all tariff and non-tariff barriers. Common Market for East and Southern Africa (COMESA) with the support from

---

**African Regional Renaissance:
New Wave of ESA Partners/Institutions**

‣ Intergovernmental Authority on
    Development (IGAD)
‣ Common Market for East and Southern
    Africa (COMESA)
‣ East and Southern Africa Business
    Organization (ESABO)
‣ All Africa Businesswomen's Association
    (AABA)
‣ Association for Strengthening Agricultural
    Research in Eastern and Central
    Africa (ASARECA)
‣ East African Cooperation (EAC)
‣ African Dialogue Center (ADC)
‣ Center for African Family Studies (CAFS)
‣ United Nations Economic Commission
    for Africa (UNECA)

REDSO/ESA, has already reduced tariffs on average by 70% with a goal of zero tariffs by 2001. The African leaders assembled in Entebbe agreed that **the private sector "is the most effective vehicle for Africa's rapid economic growth."** Our pioneering work supporting private sector organizations such as the East and Southern Africa Business Organization (ESABO) and the All Africa Businesswomen's Association (AABA) have been instrumental in framing the policy debate, giving the private sector a seat at the decision-making table and changing government views toward the private sector.

REDSO/ESA was also responsible for arranging a critical Investor Road Map presentation to all nineteen COMESA Ministers of Trade, Industry and Commerce at the November 1997 Annual Summit in Lusaka. As a result of REDSO/ESA's collaboration and initiative, **COMESA, IGAD and several individual countries have formally requested the Investor Road Map process**. In the southern region, these include Zimbabwe and Zambia. In the northern tier, the Executive Secretary of the Intergovernmental Authority on Development (IGAD) formally requested the Road Map be conducted in Eritrea, Djibouti, Ethiopia and Kenya.

The African Presidents discussed the need for African countries to further strengthen their national, sub-regional and regional integration to better face the challenges of globalization. In addition to the regional organizations noted above, REDSO/ESA support in collaboration with the Africa Bureau's Office of Sustainable Development (AFR/SD) and the Global Bureau to the Association for Strengthening Agricultural Research in Eastern and Central Africa (ASARECA), IGAD, East Africa Cooperation (EAC), and the UN's revitalized Economic Commission for Africa (UNECA) have made and will continue to make the East and Southern Africa region more productive and competitive. As an example, a **major food emergency and costly government-donor response has been avoided in Uganda (and will be mitigated in western Kenya and northern Tanzania)** due to the response of ASARECA and its regional partner networks in rapidly producing and extending a new, resistant variety of cassava in the face of rapidly spreading mosaic virus which, if not controlled, threatened to reduce Uganda's primary staple food by 50% before spreading into other countries in the region.

As the demand for food and income generating activities increases to support a growing population, it will be vital for ESA countries to properly manage their environment and natural resources. **REDSO/ESA is working with African environmental stakeholders** to identify and prioritize trans-boundary environmental and natural resources issues, particularly in the Greater Horn of Africa region, that are linked to food insecurity and conflict. Since 1995, REDSO/ESA has provided training for over 340 Non-governmental Organizations (NGO) and Private Volunteer Organizations (PVO) officers in eight African countries on environmental impact assessment and environmentally-sound activity designs. Furthermore, REDSO/ESA developed an Environmental Documentation Manual for use by USAID PL-480 Title II food-assistance partners on meeting USAID environmental review procedure and standards.

The Entebbe Summit also agreed that "peace, security and stability are necessary prerequisites for social and economic development" and further "recognized that the destiny and security of Africa lies primarily in the hands of the Africans themselves." The GHAI guiding principles of **"African ownership" and "promoting stability"** are being promoted in the Greater Horn of Africa (GHA) by IGAD, an African sub-regional organization, revitalized with USAID and other donor support. IGAD already has taken the sub-regional lead in mediating longstanding conflicts in Sudan and Somalia and is now moving into the policy harmonization arena in trade, transport and telecommunications with REDSO/ESA and other partner support.

Sustained economic growth is also directly linked with health status and population growth. Many of the ESA countries exhibit some of the worst health statistics in the world and the region's population is set to double in less than 25 years. This is closely tied to food insecurity, particularly in the Greater Horn, where, despite increased agricultural production over the last three decades, there has been a steady decrease in per-capita food production. Over the last four years, REDSO/ESA has pioneered an approach for working with countries in the region to identify the highest priority regional "cross-cutting" and "cross-border" problems affecting health delivery systems, and for assisting these countries to deal with these problems by facilitating their **sharing of "lessons learned" and "better practices."**

These regional health efforts are beginning to have a large pay off. With REDSO/ESA assistance, (a) Ethiopia now has a health care financing policy; (b) four countries are developing programs to deal with problems of adolescent reproductive health; (c) countries throughout the EAC are using regionally developed guidelines to integrate HIV/AIDS services with those of established Family Planning/Maternal-Child Health programs; (d) an effective cost-sharing scheme developed in Kenya has been replicated in two neighboring countries and is being considered for replication in a third; and, (e) the Center for African Family Studies (CAFS) has developed and is expanding a roster of African consultants who provide a range of technical assistance throughout. Almost as important as the results themselves is the growing awareness among African health professionals of the "regional" nature of the problems they are facing and the benefits that can accrue from tackling their problems together.

This past year has witnessed a transformation of the Nairobi regional office to take on expanded regional program and analysis mandates. In moving beyond its traditional services-to-bilateral-missions orientation, **REDSO/ESA is restructuring toward a multi-disciplinary, team-based platform** for managing and implementing regional initiatives such as the GHAI and the expanded humanitarian and transition programs in Somalia, Sudan and Burundi. Also, with the African regional institutional renaissance in full bloom, REDSO/ESA is taking advantage of increased opportunities for regional partnerships and concomitant development impact.

Factors Affecting Performance

REDSO/ESA performance in 1997 was affected by internal and external factors, both positive and negative. Externally, we have noted the positive developments regarding African regional organizations and partnerships. Another positive development was the **approval of the Agency's Greater Horn of Africa Strategic Plan in November 1997**, and the consequent delegation of Greater Horn of Africa Initiative implementation authority by the USAID Administrator to the REDSO/ESA Director.

On the negative side, our ability to carry out effective and timely humanitarian response efforts was constrained by exogenous factors over which we had little or no control. Most notable were the variable weather conditions of 1997-98 which saw regional drought followed by massive El Niño-related rains. The latter caused **unprecedented flooding -- in the face of rainfall averaging 500% to 900% of normal** -- which wreaked and continues to wreak havoc on the denizens of Somalia, northern Kenya and southern Ethiopia. The rains magnified the state of the deteriorated regional road network which itself showed the impact of years of low or no maintenance and where, in certain areas, notably Kenya and Tanzania, it literally collapsed.

> **Main Performance Factors**
>
> **The Good News:**
> - African Regional Renaissance
> - Increased U.S. Attention to Africa
> - Approved GHAI Strategy
> - GHAI Field Delegation
> - Redefined Regional Platform
> - REDSO-GHAI Strategy Integration
> - Team-based Restructuring
>
> **The Bad News:**
> - Unprecedented Rain and Flooding
> - Major Breakdown of Road Infrastructure
> - Ongoing Political-Humanitarian Crises
> - Lack of Internal Operational Procedures
> - New GHAI-related Staff Not On Board

Doing more than just talking about the weather, REDSO/ESA planned a successful, future-looking mitigation effort whereby GHAI and USAID's Famine Early Warning System (FEWS) sponsored a climate forum in Nairobi in February 1998. This conference **gathered more than 100 African and international climatologists and food security experts together for the first time** to develop a consensus forecast for the 1998 "long rains" and to devise a pro-active food security response plan for each Greater Horn country.

Bad weather was but one negative factor. **Ongoing country political crises** limited or precluded access to food insecure areas in Somalia, southern Sudan, Rwanda and Burundi. And, even when security and access issues were temporarily resolved, the deteriorated, El Niño-devastated regional road network showed that it could not cope with either humanitarian or economic growth user demands.

Internally, REDSO/ESA was faced with carrying out an **expanded operational mandate**

which combined good and bad news. The good news was that GHAI will provide additional funding and staff resources to tackle the broad set of Horn of Africa problems, particularly in the area of democracy/governance and conflict management. The downside was trying to operate ongoing development and humanitarian programs, expand into new areas and provide technical services without new staff on board, all while integrating the REDSO/ESA and GHAI strategies, developing and refining strategic objectives and intermediate results, and restructuring ourselves into SO and support teams.

The REDSO/ESA approved strategic framework was developed at a time when the role of the regional office was primarily one of technical-services provider to USAID bilateral assistance programs. While pointing the way toward a broader regional program mandate, the framework plus GHAI responsibilities **required a team-based realignment of staff and structure to assure responsiveness and results.**

We estimate the **REDSO/ESA reorganization and restructuring-on-the-fly will not be fully completed until the end of calendar year 1998**. This is due to the need to recruit additional staff (e.g.   D/G), to take on additional responsibilities such as the management of the entire USAID/Somalia program/portofolio (made more difficult as the two USDH both depart post in June 1998) and providing the full range of technical services to the Democratic Republic of the Congo (DROC), and put into place a reengineered and decentralized management framework, including delegations of authorities to teams and support units. As one example, REDSO/ESA has never issued any of its own Mission Orders, management notices or internatal delegations of authority. Thus, effectively starting an "implementing" regional mission from scratch will take some time.

At the same time, moving fully to a team-based structure has already shown positive rewards. There are **clear programmatic synergies** (e.g., between water resources management and conflict mediation) **to exploit, a large reserve of staff potential to tap and nurture, and great opportunities to decentralize empower teams for better and faster results.**

In sum, REDSO/ESA restructuring is a work in progress. At the same time, **the redefined regional platform continues to get results and build on prior success.** As regionalism expands and flourishes in Africa, REDSO/ESA will continue to provide technical and analytical leadership.

Summary Table

Objective Name	Rating	Evaluation Findings
SSO #1: "Effective Technical and Program Support To ESA Missions"	**Met**	An analysis of STARS and the Customer Service Survey showed that the total number of actual service days exceeded the target by 26%, while almost all the skills requested by client missions were available.
SO #2: "Increased Utilization of Critical Info. by USAID and Other Decision-makers in the Region	**Met**	This Strategic Objective represents a cross-cutting set of regional activities focused in the sub-sectors of Population and Health, Economic Growth, and Environment.
Sub-SO #2: Health, Population and Nutrition	**Exceeded**	Evaluation of Regional Health networks conducted in January 1998, showed that work plans for all 8 focus areas had to be accelerated to keep up with increasing demand for networks assistance from African partners. As a consequence, much more was achieved than originally anticipated.
Sub-SO #2: Economic Growth	**Met**	REDSO/ESA supported an official COMESA, ESABO trade mission to the U.S. that laid the ground-work for achieving President Clinton's African Trade and Investment Initiative in the region. RTAA studies revealed transport costs in the region are excessively high, which set the stage to push for transportation policy reforms.
Sub- SO #2: Environment	**Exceeded**	EIA training course evaluations by 166 participants from three countries consistently scored the course higher than 4.5 out of a maximum score of 5.
SO #3: "Establish a Strong Basis for Implementation of the Greater Horn of Africa Initiative (GHAI)"	**Met**	With the GHAI Strategy completed and approved, the Horn of Africa Support Project HASP now fully functioning with its specific targets met for the year, and REDSO/ESA restructuring to achieve GHAI results, a strong basis for implementation of the GHAI has been established.
SSO #4: "More effective responses to Humanitarian Crises and Transitions Towards Greater Self-Reliance in the ESA Region."	**Exceeded**	Field visits and customer surveys on humanitarian and transitional programs have revealed a great degree of effectiveness and have identified some new approaches for some of our grants which Bureau of Humanitarian Relief BHR has been willing to support.
Percent funding through NGOs and PVOs: FY 98 __%; FY 99 __%; FY 00 __%		

SSO #1: Effective Technical and Program Support to ESA Missions

PART II: PROGRESS TOWARD REDSO/ESA's STRATEGIC OBJECTIVES

A. Strategic Support Objective (SSO) #1: Effective Technical And Program Support To ESA Missions

1.   Performance Analysis

In FY 97, REDSO/ESA began in earnest to fully integrate GHAI into our program. Despite having significant numbers of our staff involved in this effort, REDSO/ESA exceeded by 26% its primary Intermediate Result (IR) indicator of providing services to ESA missions. Its efforts to maintain 100% of all the skills requested by ESA client missions fell a little short at 94%. Finally, with three relatively new staff not yet having received formal reengineering training, REDSO/ESA, at 97%, fell just short of the 100% target. Overall, after weighting the three measures by the degree of their importance, SSO1 performance met its targets.

> **Procurement Team**
>
> ▸ Provided quality service to 9 client Missions
> ▸ Customer oriented approach succeeded in guiding client SO Teams and Missions through the labyrinth of USG procurement regulations and procedures

Progress Towards The Strategic Support Objective (SSO) #1

During FY 97, SSO #1 continued to track objective performance indicators, baselines and targets. These performance measures are critical management tools which are essential for REDSO/ESA to help keep its staff composition responsive to client needs and ascertain what training needs its staff might acquire. Additionally, these indicators provide guidance on what technical and/or program skills may have become obsolete or, alternatively, need strengthening through staff training or recruitment.

REDSO/ESA conducted its second Customer Service Survey for the FY 97 service period. On a scale of "1 to 5", with **"1" being not significant and "5" as essential**, the ESA Missions rated REDSO/ESA's overall contribution to Missions' performance/functions and activities. Similarly strong as last year's ratings, were the following ones for FY 97:

REDSO/ESA CONTRIBUTION TO MISSION FUNCTIONS SCALE OF 1-5		
FUNCTION	**ACTIVITY**	**SCORE**
PLANNING:	**PROJECT DESIGN STRATEGY ANALYSIS**	**3.2**
ACHIEVING/IMPLEMENTATION:	**LEGAL PROCUREMENT FINANCIAL**	**3.4**
MONITORING & EVALUATION:	**PROJECT EVAL. PMP DEVELOPMENT**	**3.2**

In addition, fully 93% of the 15 client Missions surveyed indicated that REDSO/ESA's services were useful to their ability to achieve their Strategic Objectives, only one did not believe so. On a 1 to 5 satisfaction scale, the client Missions' composite of overall satisfaction with REDSO/ESA's TDY services work was 3.9, and it was 3.5 for our "virtual" support.

REDSO/ESA continues to monitor Missions' resource needs. One question on our customer survey asked how REDSO/ESA could serve client Missions better. While there were several different responses, some of the more interesting ones were as follows:

-- "The Mission feels that it could not operate without the services that REDSO provides:"

Regional Financial Management Center

- ▸ Accounting station for 14 USAID operating units
- ▸ Processed over 7,000 payments valuing $36.0 M and handled over 86,000 accounting transactions
- ▸ 620 TDY days provided direct financial assistance and integrated client training to improve client missions' program management capabilities; installed automated systems to increase efficiencies in such areas as voucher tracking, MACS code system and MACS view
- ▸ Designed and implemented payment system direct to FMS in Birmingham, Alabama; payments take 24 hours, instead of 7 days
- ▸ RFMC's recognized expertise and willing assistance goes beyond 14 clients to help establish, strengthen and support accounting systems for Budapest (65 days), Namibia (40 days), Zaire DART (10 days) and USAID/W (6 months supporting NMS/AWACS data processing).

-- "Be the locus of more centralized training. REDSO could organize and bring together people from all the missions for training in contracting, procurement, project management, administrative systems development, computer network management, financial management, monitoring and evaluation, et cetera, (It would be more cost effective than sending people to Washington or bringing TA to a single mission (and all the missions in the region could benefit)".

-- Seven missions generally expressed concern that the technical and programmatic services which they find very useful and upon which they depend seem less available than in prior years and are less certain for the future due REDSO/ESA's increasing regional program responsibilities.

Progress Towards Intermediate Results

IR 1.1: Improved Management of REDSO/ESA Services to ESA Missions

REDSO/ESA's established quantitative measure for management of services is "service days performed" as a percentage of "service days agreed." For FY 1997, the results were:

Number of service days agreed:	**4,459**
Number of service days actually performed:	**4,270**

Overall FY 1997 Gross Performance Score:	**96%** (performed v. agreed)
REDSO/ESA Target Score:	**70%** (performed v. agreed)

The number of REDSO/ESA's service days performed in some of its key skill areas were significantly more than the number agreed. REDSO/ESA responded to critical unplanned client Mission needs. Some of the notable areas were in : (a) MACS coordination 150%; (b) accounting-financial management 110% ; and, (c) democracy-governance 108% were achieved. Fully 58% of all of REDSO/ESA services were provided to the GHA bilateral Missions. Furthermore, that REDSO/ESA's exercised good judgement when it had to choose among the limited days for services available and was forced to cancel certain TDY services, as reflected by 71% of the client Missions indicating that the unmet services were not detrimental to the quality of work undertaken by their Mission.

NEW R4 Workshops

REDSO/ESA continued its support for improved regional performance monitoring and reporting with the successful development and implementation of the new R4 Workshops. Working collaboratively with senior representatives from the Africa Bureau and PPC,

REDSO/ESA facilitated two three-day sessions on the FY 2000 R4 process for participants from over 20 Missions. From the field perspective, a declaration of the workshops's success is best captured in the thank-you note from the Madagascar representatives: **"We would like to express our appreciation of this unique training which provided us an invaluable opportunity to get up-to-date USAID/W thinking on the R4 process; best practices in performance monitoring and reporting; and how to interpret the R4 2000 guidance."** Also comments from Ethiopia were in thanking REDSO and Washington for making the staff available, **"They did a terrific job and superbly demonstrated the benefits of cross bureau and field efforts working together for solid results."**

In addition to meeting an acute need for information in the field, the workshops gave Washington an opportunity to confirm to the field its commitment to a process which is expected to result in transparent technical and management reviews, timely transmission of Program Day agendas/issues, and a continuation of the transparency in resource allocation decisions. Of equal importance, the sessions provided the Washington representatives an opportunity to hear a broad spectrum of field needs and concerns and hopefully will facilitate a better understanding of the challenges facing the Agency.

Client Mission Alternatives to REDSO/ESA Services

Because the Agency continues to struggle with managing its development programs with shrinking human resources, REDSO/ESA asked client Missions from where they would prefer to obtain TDY services should they not be available from REDSO/ESA. The responses were as follows:

Contract for the services:	38%
Obtain them from AFR:	22%
Obtain them from Global:	19%
Obtain from other sources:	14%
Would not obtain them	8%

It should be noted that shifting to the first three choices for services could result in : (1) added costs for our partners; (2) lack of continuity on activity engagement, and (3) considerable delays due to the time it takes to field technical advisors.

Managing for Results/Lessons Learned

REDSO/ESA enjoys a critical result-multiplier element that is now nearly unique in the Agency. It was not planned, but rather developed spontaneously out of its long tradition of providing a multiple of technical and programmatic services to the ESA bilateral missions. With the beginning of REDSO/ESA's fledgling regional development program just a few years ago, it became apparent that the intimate knowledge of regional development problems

and African partners, gave REDSO/ESA staff a singular capability to enhance the achievements of bilateral programs and provide a regional development complementarity that coincides with the regional integration now developing in East and Southern Africa.

Based on REDSO/ESA's experience, we believe that we can more effectively support ESA client missions with TDY services and enhance REDSO/ESA's technical and programmatic regional synergies by placing the management, accountability and resource control for our services solidly within the proposed SO Teams and the restructured support offices.

While our current structure functions adequately, it has weaknesses in a couple of important areas. First, with REDSO/ESA's service function in a stand alone SSO, the management of our services staff and the resources that support them are separated from their technical and programmatic home bases. This arrangement also places technical SO Team empowerment somewhat at odds with repect to claims on staff time and complicates resource budgeting. Finally, to a certain extent this separate SSO structure inhibits the synergistic element that makes the REDSO/ESA regional platform unique.   By providing services, REDSO/ESA is able to become fully involved in a truly integrated way with the bilateral programs of our client missions. That valuable experience results in a unique perspective and understanding of ESA client programs and the prorities of their African partners. There is a significant leveraging of this knowledge across the region as our "road warriors" multiply lessons learned in virtually all fields. Furthermore, this experience-based knowledge of ESA bilateral issues engenders an in depth understanding of the development challenges across the region, making REDSO/ESA a unique platform for the achievement of a cross-border and regional program, a program that promotes critical catalytic regional networking in a varietyof technical areas and has a distinctive enhancing element that complements bilateral programs.

Therefore, for more effective support to ESA Mission's and to take better advantage of the value-added synergy created between REDSO/ESA services and its regional program, we propose to restructure our SO Framework so that services to missions and the resources that support them are integrated into each of our proposed Agency Goal-aligned SOs. SO teams will be able to maximize the balance of services resources with those of their regional activities. In several technical areas this is already a reality, but not yet for all. The restructuring will allow this to be carried to the fullest extent possible. REDOS/ESA's strong inter-SO linkages, both from their interlocking memberships and their technically complementary programs, will prevent technical tunnel vision and stovepipe mentality that traditionally has been a drag on the Agency's development successes.

Performance Data Tables SSO #1

OBJECTIVE: SSO #1 Effective Program and Technical Support to all ESA Missions
APPROVED: 6/95   **COUNTRY/ORGANIZATION:** REDSO/ESA

RESULT NAME: IR 1.1 Improved Management of REDSO/ESA Services to ESA Missions.

INDICATOR: Percent of REDSO/ESA planned service days and tasks achieved.

UNIT OF MEASURE: Percentage	YEAR	PLANNED	ACTUAL
	1995	70%	67%
SOURCE: TDY reports (STARS Data)	1996	70%	64%
INDICATOR DESCRIPTION: Number of actual service days provided by REDSO/ESA staff as a percent of the total agreed with Missions in the ESA region.	1997	70%	96%
COMMENTS: In FY 1996, Agency financial constraints and instability affected REDSO/ESA's ability to plan and provide services and Missions' capacity to host REDSO/ESA staff. Furthermore, there was no "agreed" service days in FY 1996 because of the absence of the annual scheduling conference.	1998	80%	
	1999	80%	
	2000	80%	

OBJECTIVE: SSO #1 Effective Program and Technical Support to all ESA Missions
APPROVED: 6/95   **COUNTRY/ORGANIZATION:** REDSO/ESA

RESULT NAME: IR 1.2: High Level of REDSO/ESA Staff Skills Maintained

INDICATOR: Percent of requested skills available at REDSO/ESA

UNIT OF MEASURE: Percentage	YEAR	PLANNED	ACTUAL
SOURCE: Staff records	1995	100%	100%
INDICATOR DESCRIPTION: Number of staff fully trained vs those in training status.	1996	100%	100%
	1997	100%	94%
COMMENTS: The Engineering services were available for only part of the year due the unexpected departure if the incumbent. Skills requested, but not available: engineer, basic education advisor, HIV/AIDS advisor (3 out of 50 skills not available).	1998	100%	
	1999	100%	

SO # 2: Increased Utilization of Critical Information by USAID and Other Decision-makers in the Region

Strategic Objective SO # 2: "Increased Utilization of Critical Information by USAID and Other Decision-makers in the Region"

Performance Analysis

REDSO/ESA is engaged in effectively implementing innovative activities which contributes to the achievement of USAID's overall goal of Broad Based Sustainable Development through solutions to issues which are cross-border and cross-cutting. SO #2 has supported a mixed portfolio of transnational activities in Economic Growth, Population and Health, and Environment.   REDSO/ESA's economic growth programs support African-led private sector strategies that respond to the region's development challenges and serve as an advocate for major U.S.   Government foreign policy initiatives in the ESA region such as the Presidential Partnership for Economic Growth and Opportunity in Africa and the Greater Horn of Africa Initiative. REDSO\ESA's partners include the AABA, the COMESA, the ESABO), and IGAD.   REDSO/ESA's Regional Trade Analytical Agenda (RTAA) has continued to build on the impressive achievements reported in the FY 1999 REDSO/ESA R4.   REDSO/ESA's Regional Health Networks (HN) supports critical development areas identified by REDSO/ESA's partners in Washington and in the ESA bilateral Missions, ministries of health, the NGO community and the private sector.   The environmental program supports Regional Costal Zone Demonstration Activity and the GHA Institutional Stakeholder Survey directly supports Biological diversity and Sustainable natural resource management.

GHAI: The activities supported under SO #2 support the principles of GHAI. All activities involve African partners who have participated in defining the SO #2 agenda; most of the activities are African-led and serve as an excellent example of cooperation among African technical experts dealing with issues on a regional level. REDSO/ESA supports AABA, COMESA, ESABO, and IGAD which are all leaders in the push for GHA regional integration and regional trade and investment.   In the GHAI stakeholders survey, African technical experts will take the lead in identifying the principal regional environmental and natural resources management issues related to food security and potential conflict in the GHA region.

Progress Towards the Strategic Objective (SO) #2

> SO #2 Indicator: Commitments in Critical Regional Development Areas by ESA
> Missions

This Strategic Objective represents a mixture of cross-cutting regional program focuses in Economic Growth, Population and Health, and Environment. This R4 review will show that REDSO/ESA has made commendable progress in all three areas.

SO #2: Population and Health

Performance Analysis

Strategic Objective #2 and the associated Intermediate Results (IRS), for health, population, and nutrition, have been adjusted to better achieve results. In the following sections, progress is shown in achieving the IRs associated with the preadjusted cross-sector SO#2. Indicator tables complement and support the text presentation. In order to provide a smooth and clear understanding and basis for evaluating progress with the newly adapted SO and IRs, indicator tables that include trend data and targets are also included for these IRs. When expected progress through FY 2000 is presented, the newly adapted IRs are discussed.

Progress Toward Intermediate Results

REDSO\ESA Population, Health, Nutrition (PHN) has made tremendous progress over the past year, far exceeding anticipated targets in all focus areas within the Health Networking activity. Partnerships continue to expand among African health professionals and policy makers, Cooperating Agencies (CAs), and other donors, facilitating enhanced dissemination of critical health, population and nutrition information throughout the region. The examples that follow represent the range of activities that are impacting health programs in the region.

IR 2.1 Improved availability of regional information in priority development areas

The REDSO\ESA resource center became fully functional, with over 1000 document titles entered into the ProCite bibliographic database. The Networking mailing list, catalogued by area of interest, has been expanded to include over 1,100 names. Development of the **"Better Practices in Quality of Care" database** was a collective effort of regional partners resulting from the Quality Improvement Conference. Under the integration activity, curricula information has been collected from governments and NGOs in 15 countries and the first curricula assessment completed, with recommendations to be published and disseminated in the coming year. The Center for African Family Studies (CAFs)has developed and is expanding a **roster of African consultants** which can provide a range of technical assistance services in the region. An additional roster of health care financing (HCF) consultants is also now available as is an inventory of donor-funded HCF activities.

IR 2.2 Improved models and technologies for use in priority development areas

REDSO/ESA has been instrumental in identifying, developing and facilitating the implementation of several "better practices" (models) in the region. At the "Quality Improvement for Reproductive and Child Health: Lessons Learned from Better Practices" Conference, numerous examples of better practices emerged in the areas of standards and guidelines, training, supervision, quality assurance, logistics, and cost. Under the integration activity, partners published two case studies which are included in a larger summary volume incorporating programmatic issues and research questions. The volume includes what has

become a model of integration now being adapted in the region. In addition, **a program manager's guide to models of integration for comprehensive service delivery has been produced and distributed to over 500 health professionals and 120 organizations**. In HCF, an improved version of the Health Insurance Membership, Claims, and Information System was developed and implemented at two sites in Kenya and Tanzania. REDSO/ESA also facilitated a joint planning process with USAID/Kenya, Africa Bureau and FOCUS, developing the first Adolescent Reproductive Health Results Framework in the region.

Networking Works

REDSO|ESA Health Networking is increasingly recognized as a ground breaking and workable regional "model." The SO2 team provided technical assistance to REDSO/WCA to adapt the networking model into its program. An adoption encouraged and supported by AFR/SD.

IR 2.3 Enhanced dissemination of critical regional development information.

This was a banner year in REDSO/ESA efforts to disseminate critical information throughout the region. Circulation of the Networking newsletter, *The Regional Healthnet*, expanded from 325 to 600 persons. The first edition highlighted health financing and the second, integration of Sexually Transmitted Disease/Human Immunodeficiency Virus STD/HIV services with Maternal and Child Health/Family Planning MCH/FP. Under the Postabortion Care PAC initiative, 4000 brochures entitled, *What Can You Do? Postabortion Care in East and Southern Africa,* have been distributed. As a result, stakeholders are exploring ways they can expand or initiate PAC activities, and funding for PAC programs has and continues to increase substantially. Under the integration initiative, four case studies and resulting recommendations have been published and disseminated to 565 people and presentations were made in Washington, at Aids, Population and Health Intergrated Assistance APHIA, and in Indonesia.   In addition, a state-of-the-art program manager's guide to integration was published and distributed to 1400 individuals and organizations. A *Quality Improvement for Healthier, Happier People* 1998 calendar showcasing lessons learned and better practices in the six quality improvement areas was printed and distributed to 3000 people in the region.

IR 2.4 Increased regional collaboration in addressing critical development issues

---

Regional Collaboration

▸ REDSO/ESA organized Africa-wide PHN conference and SOTA courses
▸ Greater Horn of Africa initiative - 30 partners set priority areas in nutrition

---

Under the PAC activity, a study tour was conducted in Ghana to provide an opportunity to health managers and providers from four ESA countries to learn how to improve PAC services by training non-physician providers. As a result of the tour, an active network of policy-makers, managers, service providers, and community advocates has formed to improve PAC services.   The regional logistics initiative was officially launched at a workshop attended by stakeholders from six countries where

first steps were identified in cross-border activities to strengthen Logistics Management Information Systems LMISs and procurement. Both Uganda and Mozambique Ministry of Health MOH staff visited Kenya to review progress made in the Kenya national HCF system.

IR 2.5 Strengthened human and institutional capacity to generate, analyze and use critical regional development information

REDSO/ESA developed a half-day workshop on Adolescent Reproductive Health for the African State of the Art Training SOTA course. This resulted in **increased skills and competencies in the design, implementation, monitoring, and evaluation of adolescent programs**. Postabortion care assessments in Uganda and Zambia have led to new activities. In Uganda, Delivery of Improved Services for Health DISH is piloting a training program for public health midwives in PAC which will inform government policy regarding the **critical role of midwives in improving access to services**. In building individual and institutional capacity, CAFS has strengthened its internal management systems and technology transfer skills and, in turn, trained over 150 people from 25 organizations in 27 countries. A Consulting Skills Development workshop was presented by REDSO/ESA for local professionals from five countries to promote the development and utilization of local consultants in the region.

In addition to reporting on the results achieved under the currently agreed upon intermediate results just discussed, it should be noted that **the adjusted framework specifically includes an IR focused on and supported through GHAI. Though a new IR, activities are already underway**. A large part of this IR is in support of nutrition and food security linkages in support of the GHAI. A consensus building process that has included African partner experts in food security and nutrition has identified three focus areas: 1) improved maternal, infant, and child nutrition with a focus on improving the quality of program design and implementation, 2) improved use of information and advocacy to influence policies, strategies, and programs across sectors to improve nutritional outcomes, and 3) improved maternal and child nutritional status in emergency and refugee situations. Case studies have been used in determining priority activities, micronutrient assessments are underway in several countries, an assessment of the impact of the ionization of the salt plant in Eritrea is underway in Ethiopia and the development of a minimum package for maternal nutrition will be completed by the third quarter of 1998.

Customer Feedback

While a formal customer survey has not been conducted during this reporting period, extensive feedback has been received from both customers and partners regarding the performance and results of PHN activities. In addition, an evaluation of the Regional Health Networks Activity was conducted during January/February 1998, and an evaluation of the CAFS III Project was completed in October 1997. Combined, these sources of information present a very comprehensive view of the performance of PHN activities this last year.

Unsolicited feedback on all Health Network-sponsored activities was received **from African customers** and participants **and from USAID partners in Washington and in the field.** This feedback has been extremely positive, illustrating the extent to which REDSO/ESA' s regional PHN activities are seen to "add value" to programs in the ESA Region. In the PAC initiative, a delegate of the REDSO/ESA-sponsored Ghana study tour stated, **."..we were able to share experiences from different countries, gain knowledge about how to run a project and saw that midwives *can* provide PAC services.**" Two countries, Uganda and Kenya, are now planning programs for midwives in PAC. The USAID/Tanzania PHN officer stated that the tour stimulated fresh thinking about PAC within the Tanzania health community and an effort to promote policy change regarding PAC. Africa/SD has referred to the REDSO/ESA PAC initiative as **"a model for taking research to advocacy to program change."** The results of the Network evaluation echo these views: **"It is clear that the Network has played a leading role in advocating for the inclusion of PAC...in the health reform agendas in several countries in the region.** While the issues may have been known to Network partners, it was (by their own admission) the Network activities that brought these issues into focus and onto the current agenda". As a result, USAID Missions in Zambia, Kenya and Malawi have requested further assistance from REDSO/ESA to help develop PAC programs.

Similar feedback showing the positive results of PHN regional activities was also received for the other technical areas. After the regional Quality of Care conference the Kenya Director of Crescent Medical Aid wrote: **"Immediately upon my return, a meeting was held with all of our doctors where they were briefed on the outcomes of the conference. We have so far implemented the recommendations relating to drug management and are computerizing our drug management**". USAID/Tanzania reported that "So many of the issues raised and addressed during the Mombasa Conference have or are now in the process of being addressed", and that it was "one of the most participatory" conferences ever attended.

In the Capacity Building initiative, the CAFS Project evaluation highlighted the tremendous progress being made in becoming more market-oriented and customer-focused in pursuit of self-reliance. It also found that "**Strengthened management systems** within CAFS and **improved quality of services** offered are evidenced by the increasing numbers of CAs interested in teaming with CAFS to provide services in the region." Feedback from CAs regarding REDSO/Epa interaction and information sharing with them has also been very positive. The reengineering session REDSO/ESA provided was felt to be "**very informative and useful** and certainly helped in re-thinking approaches to and presentation of work plans and results oriented reports." The Network evaluation found that "The network project was **very successful in mobilizing the CAs to take on broader roles in the region..**", while the CAs themselves pointed out that their efforts to promote better practices in various countries "have been markedly enhanced by their ability to show how those practices are being successfully implemented elsewhere in the region."

The Network evaluation not only assessed results in individual technical areas but also

examined the effectiveness of the overall Network strategy. It determined that ."..as it has been implemented over the last four years...[it] has proven to be a successful and innovative approach to promoting and facilitating important health reforms throughout the region", and **emphasizes REDSO/ESA complementary and facilitative role in its relationship with partners such as the bilateral missions, CAs, governments, NGOs and other donors in the region."**

USAID PHN officers surveyed by the evaluation supported continuation of the Network, and **indicated they "liked the networking approach", were "enormously positive" and were "well-served by REDSO/ESA." One of the most vigorous expressions of support came from a PHN officer who initially was openly skeptical of the concept, but was now a "satisfied customer"** as she saw ."..the Network as important in helping them to find ways to address ...important health problems within their country portfolios". Overall, "those interviewed were virtually unanimous in recognizing the importance of the network approach in promoting important reforms and initiatives within the region, and...underlined the value of the shared experience approach and the promotion of "south-south" technical exchanges and assistance". The evaluation also found that the Network ."..did promote a "value added" aspect to interaction with REDSO/ESA", and "USAID Missions in the region and CAs continue to demonstrate their appreciation for the approach as they participate as well as bring their own resources to the table in support of network collaborative activities."

> **From the Evaluation**
>
> ► "The networking strategy is working very well."
> ► "The Network represents an innovative, cost-effective way to advance the Agency's PHN agenda."
> ► "Network activities have expanded the scope and volume of REDSO/Epa reach and impact."
> ► "Network support appears to be unique amongst the donors operating in the region."
> ► "Networking has allowed REDSO/ESA to demonstrate a technical leadership role while building partnerships and capacity among partners and clients."
> ► "Network activities have been instrumental in advancing the cause of HCF reform in a number of countries in the region."

Managing for Results Lessons Learned

For three years the SO #2 team at REDSO/ESA worked with an SO and IRs that attempted to accommodate health and population, environment, and economic growth activities. As the team shaped activities to achieve the IRs and SO, team members became aware that the breadth represented by the SO did not provide a clear focus in the separate areas and muted potential impact. This was even more apparent as the team collected information on indicators that were helpful and unifying of the broad areas, but at the same time not as specific and sharp as they should be to assist the team in managing for results. Consequently, last year what were called the "sub SOs" of SO2 were separately presented in the R4. A mission-wide management review took place after submission of the R4s last year, and, as will be seen elsewhere in this R4, REDSO/ESA is adjusting the original cross-sector sub-SOs into separate SOs in order to be more effective and efficient.

Some of the difficulty of cross sector IRs can be seen in reporting indicators. Indicators had to be generic to capture results in multiple sectors. The population and health sub team of SO2, because of its varied activities and energetic implementation, ended up exceeding by far, the targets established by the whole SO2 team. For example, this year the population and health sub team reached 21,010 users with information on critical development areas, and the 1997 target for the whole cross-sector SO2 team was only 714.

The old, multi-sectoral, SO2 and the refocused SO4 for population and health follow:

Not only do the restated SO and IRs provide a much clearer focus to assist in better managing for results, but IR4.5 provides for the inclusion of SO4's response to the Greater Horn of Africa Presidential Initiative. In addition, IR4.6 provides a clear statement on SO4's contribution to filling the traditional REDSO/ESA role of assisting missions. Included, as it now is, as part of the overall strategic objective, it provides for **all of the team's resources and efforts to fully complement one another** in achieving the strategic objective.   The activity areas under SO2 remain the same under SO4: health care financing, integration of STD/HIV/MCH/FP services, postabortion care, adolescent reproductive health, quality of care, logistics of pharmaceutical and family planning commodities, capacity building, and nutrition.

In developing the Health Networks activity over the past four years, considerable expertise in networking has been established in the REDSO/ESA health team.   However, **in keeping with the underlying principles of African ownership and capacity building to promote sustainability, the team was aware that the manner and framework within which results were being achieved, needed to be adjusted,** while still achieving the results intended under the preadjusted framework.

In particular, the adjusted IR4.2, Improved technical capacity of regional partners; IR4.4, Country level implementation; and IR4.5, Enhanced African capacity to implement household level nutrition and other child survival interventions, all place clearer emphasis upon developing African capacity. A new results package is being developed to accommodate achieving the intermediate results and strategic objective, while more effectively achieving African ownership and capacity building to promote sustainability**.**

Expected Progress Through FY 2000 (illustrative examples)

A new results package will be developed by mid 1998 that will permit the SO4 team to anticipate and plan implementation activities in a manner not previously possible.   Resource certainty has been absent in the past.   With the regularization of funding and planning the team anticipates exciting impact in achieving the adjusted SO - Improved Child and Reproductive Health Systems in East and Southern Africa.   The team will move as rapidly as possible to develop the capacity of African institutions and to transfer networking activities to those institutions The team has included tables that show specific targets in the accompanying tables and the following, brief statements about expected progress.

Previous Multi Sector SO	**Adjusted HPN SO**
SO #2: Increased Utilization of Critical Information by USAID and Other Decision-makers in the Region.	SO #4: Improved Child and Reproductive Health Systems in East and Southern Africa.
IR2.1 Improved Availability of Regional Information in Priority Development Areas.	IR4.1 Strengthened Iinformation Networks.
	IR4.2 Improved Technical Capacity of Regional Partners.
IR2.2 Improved Models and Technologies for Use in Priority Development Areas.	IR4.3 Improved Policy Environment.
	IR4.4 Country Level Implementation.
IR2.3 Enhanced Dissemination of Critical Regional Development Information.	IR4.5 Enhanced African Capacity to Implement Household Level Nutrition and Other Child Survival Interventions.
IR2.4 Increased Regional Collaboration in Addressing Critical Regional Development Issues.	IR4.6 Enhanced Capacity for ESA Missions to Attain their PHN SOs/IRs.
IR2.5 Strengthened Human and Institutional Capacity to Generate, Analyze, and Use Critical Regional Development Information.	

The adjusted framework and the results package guided by the framework will transfer responsibility for Health Networking to established African institutions, based upon their organizational readiness to undertake networking in particular focus areas and their experience in working with networking partners in the region. Others will be identified over the life of the results package that have the potential to develop capacity in networking and support will be provided to strengthen them where deemed appropriate. In this transition period, the REDSO health team will work closely with its African and CA partners to continue to foster and expand the existing networks in the eight focus areas, as well as to identify others focus areas that may be developed in the future.

Initially, there will continue to be strong professional representation in the REDSO health team to guide the transition process. Critical to this process is a "teaming and mentoring" approach wherein both REDSO health team members and the CA partners will team with selected African professionals and institutions in a mentoring relationship to build local capacity. In particular, a number of African institutions will be identified at the start to conduct and oversee networking activities in one or more focus areas. This will involve activities such as organizing workshops and study tours, identifying appropriate professionals to undertake "better practice" studies, and assisting to set-up electronic linkages within the networks. Over the first two to three years, REDSO and the CA partners will continue to work closely with these African institutions in developing and carrying out these activities.

As these institutions develop greater capacity to facilitate networking, however, REDSO's and the CAs' mentoring and management role will diminish and, by the end of the results package, will be phased out. Another important aspect of this transition is the development of African technical capacity to serve the region. Through such activities as consultant skills workshops, the ability of African professionals to provide quality technical assistance (TA)

will be improved. These African consultants, specialists in particular focus areas, will initially be teamed with REDSO and CA partners to provide focused cross-border TA, but with the expectation that over the five year period of the results package, a roster of skilled African consultants, able to provide quality cross-border TA, will be established in the region.

An example of where major emphasis will be placed over the next few years is in developing the linkage and operations with East, Central and Southern African College of Nurses ECSACON (a regional council representing schools of nursing) who can be instrumental in establishing curriculum, policy, and administrative protocols in quality of care, integration, postabortion care, adolescent reproductive health, logistics, and in establishing cost sharing guidelines, a task getting shifted to many nurses within the burgeoning decentralized systems in the region.

A expanded activity, already underway, will be the expansion and adaptation of the Kenya logistics model.   This has already begun in Zambia and Mozambique and emanating from the regional logistics workshop are requests from Tanzania and Uganda.

Receiving continuing policy attention during the next few years will be postabortion care and adolescent reproductive health, areas where major initiatives are already underway.   The target is to have PAC integrated into six USAID missions' activities in reproductive health by the year 2000.   Also receiving major attention will be improving financing, resource allocation, and sustainability within the context of fiscal decentralization.

A major area being developed is nutrition and food security linkages with a focus on the greater horn of Africa. **By the year 2000 all of the identified participating countries in the greater horn, functioning as a network will assess nutritional needs, implement selected interventions in their countries, and monitor progress in order to collectively manage the available resources for the greatest impact**.

Regional University Course in Q of C

Within the next two years an accredited course will be established at Makarere. University, based on regional critical needs and focused upon partner defined six focal areas of Q of C: standards and guidelines, training, supervision, logistics, quality assurance and cost and quality.

The complementary roles of Networking activities and the traditional technical assistance to missions has become clear throughout the region.   A major expanded effort over the next three years will be with AFR/SD, Global, and the regional missions to develop more and useful communication and exchange mechanisms among regional missions and with the expanding array of networking partners.   This will be done partially through using the Internet, as the Leland Initiative will be working with SO4, as a pilot activity, in establishing

internet connectivity among the PHNs within the region and our Washington partners.

Performance Data Tables SO # 2: Population and Health

OBJECTIVE: SO #2 Increased Utilization of Critical Information by USAID and Other Decision-makers in the Region

APPROVED: 6/94   **COUNTRY/ORGANIZATION**: REDSO/ESA

RESULT NAME: IR 2.1: Improved Availability of Regional Information in Priority Development Areas

INDICATOR: Presence of appropriate data bases in priority development areas.

UNIT OF MEASURE: Number of databases.	YEAR	PLANNED (HPN)	ACTUAL (HPN)
SOURCE: Reports.	1994	0	0
	1995	0	4
INDICATOR DESCRIPTION: Databases include mailing lists, program inventory's, assessments and situation analysis'.	1996	6	8
COMMENTS: A new SO with new indicators has been proposed that will better measure the results of the teams efforts.	1997	4	25
	1998 (T)	See summary table with new, revised indicators.	

OBJECTIVE: SO #2 Increased utilization of critical information by USAID and other decision-makers in the region.

APPROVED: 6/94   **COUNTRY/ORGANIZATION:** REDSO/ESA

RESULT NAME: Improved models and technologies for use in priority development areas.

INDICATOR: Number of improved or new models and technologies.

UNIT OF MEASURE: Number.	YEAR	PLANNED (HPN)	ACTUAL (HPN)
SOURCE: TDYs, participating Missions, reports	1994	0	0
INDICATOR DESCRIPTION: Missions/programs actively using models and technologies that have been shared/borrowed/adapted across borders.	1995	0	4
	1996	4	6
	1997	12	25
COMMENTS: A new SO with new indicators has been proposed that will better measure the results of the teams efforts.	1998 (T)	**See summary table with new, revised indicators.**	

OBJECTIVE: SO #2 Increased Utilization of Critical Information by USAID and other Decision-makers in the Region

APPROVED: 6/94 **COUNTRY/ORGANIZATION:** REDSO/ESA

RESULT NAME: IR 2.2: Enhanced Dissemination of Critical Regional Development Information

INDICATOR: Number of users receiving critical regional development information.

UNIT OF MEASURE: Number.	YEAR	PLANNED (HPN)	ACTUAL (HPN)
SOURCE: Mailings, TDYs, reports, e-mail	1994	0	0
	1995	0	355
INDICATOR DESCRIPTION: Numbers of users receiving critical regional development information at workshops, in meetings, on TDYs, through materials dissemination, etc.	1996	400	1,200
COMMENTS: A new SO with new indicators has been proposed that will better measure the results of the teams efforts.	1997	2,000	21,010
	1998 (T)	**See summary table with new, revised indicators.**	

OBJECTIVE: SO #2 Increased Utilization of Critical Information by USAID and Other Decision-makers in the Region

APPROVED: 6/94   **COUNTRY/ORGANIZATION:** REDSO/ESA

RESULT NAME: IR 2.4: Increased Regional Collaboration in Addressing Critical Regional Development Issues

INDICATOR: Number of stakeholders collaborating in addressing critical regional development issues.

UNIT OF MEASURE: Number	YEAR	PLANNED (HPN)	ACTUAL (HPN)
SOURCE: TDYs, participating Missions, reports	1994	12	14
INDICATOR DESCRIPTION: Number of Missions and other stakeholders, who are collaborating in regional cross-border activities in addressing critical regional development issues.	1995	17	21
	1996	35	56
	1997	65	213
COMMENTS: A new SO with new indicators has been proposed that will better measure the results of the teams efforts.	1998 (T)	**See summary table with new, revised indicators.**	

OBJECTIVE: SO #2 Increased utilization of critical information by USAID and other decision-makers in the region.

APPROVED: 6/94   **COUNTRY/ORGANIZATION:** REDSO/ESA

RESULT NAME: IR 2.5: Strengthened human and institutional capacity to generate, analyze and use critical regional development information.

INDICATOR: Number of institutions with strengthened human and organizational capacity to generate, analyze and use critical regional development information.

UNIT OF MEASURE: Number.	YEAR	PLANNED (HPN)	ACTUAL (HPN)
SOURCE: TDYs, participating Missions, reports	1994	1	1
INDICATOR DESCRIPTION: Number of institutions with strengthened human and organizational capacity to generate, analyze and use critical regional development information.	1995	5	12
	1996	18	23
COMMENTS: A new SO with new indicators has been proposed that will better measure the results of the teams efforts.	1997	30	42
	1998 (T)	**See summary table with new, revised indicators.**	

SO #2: Economic Growth

SO #2: Economic Growth and Support to GHAI

Performance Analysis

The economic growth component of REDSO/ESA Strategic Objective #2 has met and in many instances exceeded the program targets established for 1997. More important, as the USG reorients its development focus in Africa towards private sector led trade and investment, REDSO/ESA regional programs are laying the foundation for potential success in East and Southern Africa. This 24 nation region has a population of over 360 million and a combined gross domestic product of $330 billion. REDSO/ESA economic growth programs have been instrumental in helping African decision-makers understand the need for liberalized and harmonized trade policies and the importance of establishing a policy environment which is investor friendly. REDSO/ESA is also actively involved in identifying potential opportunities for trade and investment between the American and African private sector.

REDSO/ESA economic growth programs support African-led private sector initiatives that respond to the region's development challenges. These serve to advocate for major U.S. Government foreign policy initiatives in the ESA region, such as: the Presidential Partnership for Economic Growth and Opportunity in Africa and the Greater Horn of Africa Initiative. In addition, REDSO/ESA is advancing other Agency objectives for the expansion of economic opportunities for the region's traditionally marginalized groups, such as women. REDSO/ESA's partners in the private sector oriented ESABO, COMESA, AABA and IGAD.

REDSO/ESA's longer-term focus in promoting liberalized and harmonized trade is epitomized by the Regional Trade Analytical Agenda (RTAA). This activity has made excellent progress in achieving its objectives during the past year. The RTAA emphazises focus on dissemination, implementation and utilization of analysis to influence policy reforms relating to transportation costs, comparative advantage and cross-border trade.

Progress Toward Intermediate Results

Intermediate Result (IR) 2.1: Improved Availability of Regional Information in Priority Development Areas

USAID's ongoing support for the RTAA continues to enhance the availability of critical regional information in the ESA region. The RTAA was developed through an eight-month consultative process with private and public sector representatives throughout ESA. This consultative process identified three areas crucial to increasing trade and enhancing economic growth and food security: 1) increased cross-border trade; 2) reduced transportation costs; and, 3) comparative advantage analysis. Initiated at the end of FY 93, the RTAA is addressing issues pertaining to these areas through policy analysis and dialogue. This is a continuous consultative process which involves Africans in the design, implementation and evaluation of the RTAA. The analytical agenda is driven by stakeholders in the region.

Under the cross-border trade studies, committees are now acting on recommended reforms and on an agenda for follow-up analyses. Identified reforms have, so far, been centered around the need to reduce impediments to trade. These include the need to reduce trade barriers and a move towards harmonization and rationalization of trade policies and tariff rates. Transportation committees are currently working on a wide range of interventions, including; standardizing transit goods documentation; enforcing axle load limits; eliminating road blocks; upgrading railway capacity; and, delinking road and lake services in the region. In 1997 alone, 15 meetings and workshops have been held to examine the results from these analyses and to develop follow-up policy reform agendas. By bringing these results into the public domain for debate and discussion, the program has increased the amount of information available for utilization by decision-makers. At present a wide number of stakeholders are using this information including critical regional organizations such as COMESA, EAC, ESABO and the Southern Africa Development Community (SADC). The RTAA has continued to sucessfully build on the impressive achievements reported in the FY 1997 REDSO/ESA Results Review and Resource Request — to date, all of the targeted USAID Missions in ESA (88%) are now actively involved in the RTAA.

Reports on informal cross-border trade (ICBT) have been finalized for four studies (Kenya/Uganda and Malawi, Mozambique and Tanzania and their neighbors) and the agenda has moved into the next phase for information dissemination and policy dialogue. Country teams have been established to address key policy issues emerging from the initial analyses. Reports on the comparative advantage analysis have also been completed for seven countries, (Malawi, Mozambique, South Africa, Swaziland, Tanzania, Zambia and Zimbabwe), and a regional database is now available on CD-ROM. Results from these studies are now being utilized by senior SADC policymakers.

Overall, the ICBT studies have shown that informal cross-border trade is grossly underestimated - at some borders far eclipsing the level of official trade. For example, the informal sector accounts for 90% of the total exchanges between Mozambique and Swaziland, - an annual trade estimated at $20m. A large proportion of informal trade occurs in food commodities and has significant consequences for food security in the ESA region. Informal food exports from Uganda to Kenya were estimated to make up $57m of the total $62m informal export trade - a figure four times the level of recorded trade. Informal trade also offers employment to a large number of people. Over half of the traders interviewed in Mozambique were unemployed before they started their trading activities, and monthly incomes were on average four times the minimum wage. The implementation of reforms derived from these studies (see above) will ultimately reduce barriers to intra-African trade and the cost of that trade leading to increased income and food security in the region.

IR 2.2: Improved Models and Technologies for Use in Priority Development Areas

The ICBT methodology is currently being applied in six countries (Kenya, Malawi, Mozambique, Tanzania, Uganda and Zambia) and extension of the model into two new countries in the region (Zimbabwe and Ethiopia) is planned. The transportation component of

the ICBT model has enabled researchers to pinpoint areas where reforms and investment can lower transport costs significantly in the GHAI region. The comparative advantage analysis model - based on agroecological zones - has been applied to seven countries in Southern Africa within a regional context (see above). With market liberalization taking place in the region, a key aspect to achieving food security will be through regional trade based on a comparative advantage. The SADC free trade protocol is based on this premise. This analysis which is to be followed up by dialogue between stakeholders in the region, pinpoints regions (agroecological zones) which should specialize in specific commodities to be traded to achieve regional food security. The RTAA is complementary to bilateral mission activities and also helps bridge the gap between the AFSI (Africa Food Security Initiative) and ATRIP (Africa Trade and Investment Partnership Initiative).

In 1997, the All-Africa Businesswomen's Association (AABA) launched its trade network, the AABAnet, on Internet. It is currently perceived as the flagship of the organization's programs. AABA is continuing to enhance the capability of the AABAnet. To date, AABA has applied for membership with the World Trade Centers Associations so that its members can access the WTC trade network, and it is using the developed member profiles to identify specialized trade leads with U.S. companies. Further, AABA is working with the creators of the Investment Road Map, The Services Group, to adapt that framework to identify the gender gap to investment, that is, the gender specific constraints that female investors face that are compounded by the general constraints faced by all investors. It is anticipated that the studies will cover three countries in the region and should result in identifying policy issues that will form part of the AABA policy agenda.

IR 2.3: Enhanced Dissemination of Critical Regional Development Information

Dissemination of results from the ICBT, transportation and comparative advantage studies has taken place in workshops and seminars conducted at the national, regional and international levels. In addition, findings from the RTAA have been presented at international agricultural economics meetings in 1995 (Harare, Zimbabwe) and 1997 (Sacramento, CA, USA). Formal and informal briefings with regional policymakers and stakeholders have been conducted. In 1997 alone, briefings on the findings of the RTAA were given to: the Ministers of Agriculture and Lands in the Republic of South Africa; the SADC food security policy steering group; the Senior SADC Ministerial Drought Task Force; and, to senior advisors to Ministers of Agriculture in South Africa, Mozambique and Zimbabwe. In addition, information from the RTAA was used for discussion between the Presidents of Malawi and Tanzania.

In conjunction with presentations at the International Agricultural Economists Conference in Sacramento where publications were distributed to 97 people from 30 countries, briefings were organized for Senior USAID management, the Department of State Food Security Advisor and the Department of Agriculture's Foreign Agriculture Service's Acting Administrator. The purpose of the briefings by African members of the RTAA team

(including: the Chief Economist from the Office of the President, Kenya; the Senior Economic Advisor to the Ministry of Trade and Industry in Uganda; members of the SADC food security task force and the Head of ECPPAPA), was to inform USG decision-makers involved in Africa, on findings and process being taken to move the RTAA agenda from "Analysis to Policy Change through Dialogue".

To date, 546 regional stakeholders have been involved in the RTAA meetings, well exceeding the target of 250. Seventeen reports have been published under the USAID Africa Bureau Sustainable Development (SD) Series, and 13 additional reports are being prepared for publication. The RTAA has also increased the dissemination of results and progress through the development of an Internet webpage (http:://206.65.85.110//). Through the site, all current information about the regional trade program can be accessed - including databases, reports, special papers and presentations - creating a rich and easy-to-use information resource for government and private sector actors interested in African trade. In addition to these activities, a targeted media strategy has been developed. To date, four articles have been published by a major regional newspaper, the Nairobi-based *East African*. Three articles have addressed the costs of transportation in East Africa, and one the informal cross-border trade between Kenya and Uganda.

Over the past ten months, AABA has also held three workshops, bringing together a total of 120 female entrepreneurs, to disseminate information on the AABAnet and its potential for identifying international trade links. A seminar on "Business Linkages and Information Networking" was held in Nairobi and attended by 30 female entrepreneurs in October 1997. Through their web site, AABA has listed its members business profiles and their products. AABA has also published two issues of its quarterly newsletter, <u>AABA Business Link</u>, with a circulation of over 1,000 copies each to members and partners in Africa, disseminating information on AABA activities and trade opportunities

IR 2.4: Increased Regional Collaboration in Addressing Critical Regional Development Issues

Following the success of the East African Transportation Initiative (EATI), which was established under the RTAA after a follow-up symposium in mid-1995 in Arusha, Tanzania, with members from both the public and private sectors, a parallel committee has been set up in the Northern Tier of the Greater Horn of Africa (a subregion made up of Djibouti, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Somalia and Sudan) with a similar mandate - to press for reforms in the transportation sector and hence help to reduce the costs of transportation and trade. The Northern Tier Committee has identified 20 key reforms and recommendations for which it is actively campaigning. If implemented, these reforms have the potential to reduce the costs of transportation significantly. The EATI continues its work of lobbying for reforms such as standardization of transit goods documentation, enforcement of axle load limits, elimination of road blocks, and the of upgrading railway capacity. Over one-third of the recommendations identified through the consultative process and research results, have already been implemented.

The development of a follow-up agenda and recommendations from the ICBT analyses have led to increased interaction and collaboration between researchers, public sector officials and the business community in the region. The formation of regional policy teams has created a forum for discussion and action on regional trade issues. The RTAA continues its collaboration and dialogue with several regional institutions and organizations including Bunda College in Malawi, COMESA, EAC, ESABO, IGAD, SADC, the United Nations Economic Commission for Africa (UNECA), and the Universities of Pretoria, Swaziland and Zambia. Recently, researchers working with the program were invited to brief a meeting of SADC ministers on informal cross border trade in the region and its implications for food security.

While intra-Africa trade between and amongst AABA members has taken place, there is little information to indicate the levels, volumes, sources and destinations. In response, AABA has designed an "AABA Member Survey" instrument in order to capture this data. Of particular benefit to the organization has been the relationships developed with ESABO and COMESA to look at policy issues affecting women's investment in the region.

IR 2.5: Strengthened Human and Institutional Capacity to Generate, Analyze and Use Critical Regional Development Information

The RTAA continues to expand the involvement of individuals and institutions in the design, articulation, execution and dissemination of its research. Currently 469 individuals are involved in the program. The expansion of research into new countries has greatly widened the net of stakeholders who now benefit from the forum that the regional trade agenda provides. Through the applications of new models and methodologies, researchers are expanding their own skills as well as providing critical information for decision-makers.

AABA, on the other hand, has been plagued by institutional problems brought about by contractor weaknesses. After the successful development of a unique Business Plan, AABA has been unable to implement membership programs due to incomplete deliverables by a USAID contractor. These delayed the implementation of the AABAnet by up to six months, and the hiring of an Executive Director by eleven months. Due to these problems, REDSO/ESA suspended the implementation of this activity for three months while re-negotiating the contract in an attempt to guarantee the quality of the product. These delays, coupled with the confused supplier situation, have had serious consequences for AABA's ability to generate or use regional information and it has necessitated the review of a number of the arrangements entered into by the contractor. With an additional small grant to AABA, REDSO/ESA has attempted to ameliorate the extreme effects of the organization's weakened capacity, as a stop-gap measure, while the new team within the organization re-assesses their position and strategy.

Managing for Results/Lessons Learned

All performance targets for RTAA under the above IRs were exceeded due to the high importance of the regional trade agenda to many countries and governments, which facilitated their support and cooperation. Increased emphasis on regional institutions has meant that the research has a wide and receptive audience and a high level of active participation. The RTAA's approach — **policy change through analysis and dialogue** — has proven to be highly effective. The initial consultative process led to the identification of the three themes covered by the RTAA — **cross-border trade, transportation costs and comparative advantage** — which were seen as central to increasing trade and enhancing economic growth and food security in the region. Stakeholders have been involved at all stages of the process, and far more people are involved than in traditional donor approaches to policy reforms. This high level of involvement and ownership means that there is a much greater chance that reforms will be implemented. Policies have been developed within the region, rather than imposed from outside, thus their importance is recognized.

Even though AABA has stayed afloat during these difficult times, the quality of support and the quantity of resources provided to AABA will have to be enhanced if the organization is to achieve its regional goals and objectives.

Expected Progress Through FY 2000

The country dissemination workshops held on informal cross-border trade have led to a clear set of recommendations and actions that will be followed up to the end of FY 2000. Discussions with a broad range of stakeholders means that the program had a mandate to act on the recommendations of the seminars and workshops held on its research results. The RTAA will continue to support and advise the committees set up under the sub-themes of the program. A number of avenues for follow-up research have been identified and will be acted on. These included: estimating the costs and benefits of further trade liberalization measures in an effort to help governments in the region feel more comfortable in taking these steps; and analysis of the impact of import and export bans in times of food shortage. These follow-up analyses will be used to help prepare a series of commodity and country policy briefs. These will be commodity specific and cover those products that have been identified as key to the region's economies and/or key to food security. The targeted media strategy is to be continued, with televised panel discussions on the key issues emerging from the regional trade activities planned. Articles for both national and regional print media will also be prepared. A further analysis of transportation costs in Southern Africa is planned.

AABA has embarked on an "Africa - America Business Partnership Program" with the U.S. based Corporate Council on Africa (CCA).   This creative relationship seeks to build partnerships that will represent both African and American corporations and businesses and which will encourage increased business and investment in Africa.   The CCA is already seeking to expand this concept with ESABO.

Performance Data Tables: SO # 2 - Economic Growth

OBJECTIVE: SO #2: Increased Utilization of Critical Information by USAID and Other Decision-makers in the Region -- Economic Growth
APPROVED: 6/93 **COUNTRY/ORGANIZATION:** REDSO/ESA

RESULT NAME: SO #2 Increased Utilization of Critical Information by USAID and Other Decision-makers in the Region -- Regional Trade Analytical Activities & AABA

INDICATOR: Percentage increase of ESA Missions actively investing and participating in REDSO/ESA critical regional development areas

UNIT OF MEASURE / SOURCE / DESCRIPTION	YEAR	PLANNED	ACTUAL
UNIT OF MEASURE: Percentage of ESA Missions (17) participating or investing in the regional trade activities	93		12%
	1994	25%	41%
SOURCE: Quarterly reports from program implementors	1995	45%	65%
	1996	65%	72%
INDICATOR DESCRIPTION: Missions which are investing funds in the regional trade activities and/or facilitate activities that work in their countries. The latter includes providing country clearance, identifying contracts, etc.	97	70%	88%
	1998	75%	
COMMENTS:			

OBJECTIVE: SO #2: Increased Utilization of Critical Information by USAID and Other Decision-makers in the Rregion -- Economic Growth
APPROVED: 9/93 **COUNTRY/ORGANIZATION:** REDSO/ESA

RESULT NAME: IR 2.1: Improved Availability of Regional Information in Priority Development Areas -- Regional Trade Analytical Activities & AABA

INDICATOR: Number of appropriate regional databases and regional research agendas

UNIT OF MEASURE: Number of regional databases and regional research agendas	YEAR	PLANNED	ACTUAL
	1993		0
SOURCE: Quarterly reports from program implementors	1994	2	2
	1995	15	13
INDICATOR DESCRIPTION: Number of regional databases and regional research agendas	1996	30	33
	1997	35	69
	1998	40	
COMMENTS:			

OBJECTIVE: SO #2: Increased Utilization of Critical Information by USAID and Other Decision-makers in the Region -- Economic Growth

APPROVED: 9/93   **COUNTRY/ORGANIZATION:** REDSO/ESA

RESULT NAME: IR 2.2: Improved Models and Technologies for Use in Priority Development Areas -- Regional Trade Analytical Activities & AABA

INDICATOR: Number of new models developed

UNIT OF MEASURE: Number of models	**YEAR**	**PLANNED**	**ACTUAL**
	1993		0
SOURCE: Quarterly reports from program implementors	1994	1	1
	1995	6	7
INDICATOR DESCRIPTION: Number of models	1996	3	4
	1997	4	4
COMMENTS:	1998	4	

OBJECTIVE: SO #2: Increased Utilization of Critical Information by USAID and Other Decision-makers in the region -- Economic Growth
APPROVED: 9/93 **COUNTRY/ORGANIZATION:** REDSO/ESA

RESULT NAME: IR 2.3: Enhanced Dissemination of Critical Regional Development Information -- Regional Trade Analytical Activities & AABA

INDICATOR: Number of persons and institutions receiving critical regional development information and number of regional discussion forums

UNIT OF MEASURE: Number of persons and institutions receiving critical regional development information and number of regional discussion forums	YEAR	PLANNED	ACTUAL
	1993		0
SOURCE: Quarterly reports from program implementors	1994	50	80
	1995	100	225
	1996	350	577
INDICATOR DESCRIPTION: Number of persons/institutions attending meetings and receiving RTAA publications and number of regional meetings and workshops	1997	650	1166
	1998	875	
COMMENTS:			

OBJECTIVE: SO #2: Increased utilization of critical information by USAID and other decision-makers in the region -- Economic Growth

APPROVED: 9/93 **COUNTRY/ORGANIZATION:** REDSO/ESA

RESULT NAME: IR 2.4: Increased Regional Collaboration in Addressing Critical Regional Development Issues -- Regional Trade Analytical Activities & AABA

INDICATOR: Number of stakeholders participating in intra-regional events

UNIT OF MEASURE: Number of stakeholders	YEAR	PLANNED	ACTUAL
	1993		0
SOURCE: Quarterly reports from program implementors	1994	50	75
	1995	120	125
INDICATOR DESCRIPTION: Number of stakeholders participating in intra-regional events	1996	200	232
	1997	300	546
COMMENTS:	1998	600	

OBJECTIVE: SO #2: Increased Utilization of Critical Information by USAID and Other Decision-makers in the Region -- Economic Growth
APPROVED: 9/93 **COUNTRY/ORGANIZATION:** REDSO/ESA

RESULT NAME: IR 2.5: Strengthened human and institutional capacity to generate, analyze and use critical regional development information -- Regional Trade Analytical Activities & AABA

INDICATOR: Number of REDSO/ESA assisted African stakeholders generating, analyzing and using critical regional development information

UNIT OF MEASURE: Number of REDSO/ESA assisted African stakeholders	YEAR	PLANNED	ACTUAL
	1993		0
SOURCE: Quarterly reports from program implementors	1994	100	75
	1995	225	250
	1996	372	427
INDICATOR DESCRIPTION: Number of African stakeholders generating, analyzing and/or using critical regional development information	1997	400	469
	1998	900	
COMMENTS:			

New Economic Growth/Private Sector Strategic Objective (SO)

Overview and Factors Affecting Program Performance

REDSO/ESA, has for the first time developed a strategic objective framework and established an SO team dedicated to program support for the African private sector. However, in this R4, reporting on activities in the economic growth/private sector arena are reported under SO #2 - *Increased Utilization of Critical Information by USAID and Other Decision-makers in the Region–Economic Growth*. The next R4 will reflect a new economic growth and private sector strategic objective framework that

---

PERFORMANCE

‣ REDSO/ESA accelerated reforms and promoted free markets in the ESA region.

‣ REDSO/ESA brokered ground-breaking dialogue between Africa's economic decision-makers and inter-governmental organizations in Africa as well as American business organizations to advance the trade component of the Africa Growth and Opportunity legislation in advance of the U.S. Presidential visit to Africa.

‣ REDSO/ESA promoted a new approach of African to African technical assistance that has led to a variety of organizational partnerships that stimulate policies and programs that empower a greater role for the African entrepreneur in cross border and international trade.

---

more accurately include the focus and purpose of REDSO/ESA' s activities in the economic growth/ private sector area. In this section, reference is given to "The Basis for a New Program for Partnership". This was deliberately done since there was no baseline data required for the newly created Economic Growth/Private Sector Team to meet this year's SO #2 reporting.

In early 1998, a private sector/economic growth SO team was formed. This supports the strategic shift from an exclusively bilateral TDY approach, to a regional economic growth/private sector program which will increase support for two Presidential Initiatives; the Greater Horn of Africa Initiative and the President's Partnership for Economic Growth in Africa. Bilateral services will continue to be provided in concert with the establishment of the new regional private sector program.

Despite not having a private sector economic growth strategic framework in the last five years, REDSO/ESA and it's African private sector partners have achieved remarkable success, therefore necessitating a new and dedicated objective for private sector oriented economic growth in the region. For the current reporting period, REDSO/ESA's economic growth and private sector

performance can be characterized in three ways: (a) accelerated reforms and free market promotion; (b) brokered dialogue to promote African-American trade; and, (c) promoted African-to-African technical assistance. (see box).

REDSO/ESA took a leadership role in the region in understanding and preparing for the momentous paradigm shift from aid dependency to a trade driven agenda. This is being done in full partnership with progressive African stakeholders. Consequently, a meaningful expansion of REDSO/ESA resources will be necessary as the USG reorients its development focus in Africa towards private sector trade and investment. REDSO/ESA is preparing for this anticipated expansion by developing a private sector/economic growth strategic plan. African-led regional programs, jointly developed with African business and trade associations and intergovernmental organizations, will be the foundation of the plan. This will ignite opportunities for a more open and market-driven economy in East and Southern Africa.

Progress Towards the Strategic Objective #2

REDSO/ESA Approach to the African
Private Sector: The Basis for a New Program for Partnership

REDSO/ESA spent the last three years building relationships with the Eastern and Southern Africa Business Organization (ESABO), the East African Cooperation (EAC), the All African Businesswomen's Association (AABA), the Common Market for East & Southern Africa (COMESA) and the Intergovernmental Authority on Development (IGAD). This was done in order to develop an African-led private sector program that will lead to enhanced commercial opportunities.

REDSO/ESA was on two tracks. One was an analytical research agenda that would research and disseminate cross-border trade and transport information to various groups and individuals in the region. The second track has been directly involved in business development and private sector oriented partnerships between and among young, but aggressive, regional institutions. This was done by helping to organize reverse trade missions, regional business/intergovernmental consultative meetings and a host of other information sharing sessions.

Both tracks were instrumental in helping African decision-makers understand the need for liberalized and harmonized trade polices and the importance of establishing a policy environment which is investor and entrepreneur-friendly. Consequently, FY 98 will represent the first year that REDSO/ESA will have a fully dedicated economic growth/private sector Strategic Objective and program encompassing both tracks.

REDSO/ESA recognizes that the African private sector has been practically ignored in policymaking in the region. We have sought and received African leadership - through the successful model of Uganda's National Forum - to try to overcome the neglect of the African private sector being the last consulted and the first casualty of poor policymaking. Therefore, providing a platform for a regional business voice is required so that the private sector can begin to provide timely and reliable information to policymakers.

Progress Toward Intermediate Results: Economic Growth and Private Sector

IR2.1: Improved Availability of Regional Information in Priority Development Areas

The Basis for a New Program for Partnership

REDSO/ESA's success in improving the availability of regional information in priority areas can also be illustrated by the example of using lessons learned from successful African public/private models such as the Uganda National Forum. USAID/Uganda and REDSO/ESA assistance to the Forum has made the Forum a public/private advocacy model for the region.

The Uganda National Forum was conceived by a small group of reform-minded public servants and visionary private sector leaders, as a way to stimulate efforts to promote private sector growth. REDSO/ESA supported the attendance of 150 senior government and private sector representatives to a series of workshops organized by ESABO. One of these workshops outlined the "how-to" of organizing a national public/private sector economic policy forum similar to the Uganda National Forum model. This provided a stimulus for the recent creation of a Business Council for the East African Cooperation. REDSO/ESA can take credit for the lessons learned from the Forum and for the creation of the East African Business Council. Numerous requests for replication of the Forum in the region are being facilitated by REDSO/ESA.

IR2.2: Improved Models and Technologies for Use in Priority Development Areas

The Basis for a New Program for Partnership: Greater Horn of Africa Initiative (GHAI); Convergence between COMESA, ESABO & IGAD on National and Regional Road Maps

REDSO/ESA has developed a strategy, with its African partners, to enhance the role of the private sector ensure regional food security.   One way to implement an enabling environment for Africa and foreign investor's potential involvement in food production and marketing is to use a process that identifies remedies to overcome bureaucratic constraints to food security. This is called the Road Map Process. The Road Map Process identifies and rectifies massive procedural delays and hassles forming secondary-tier barriers to regional trade and investment.

To disseminate this technology, REDSO/ESA facilitated dialogues with the private sector and it's role with GHAI, with the Executive Secretary of IGAD and members of ESABO and COMESA. REDSO/ESA was directly responsible for arranging a critical Road Map presentation to all the 19 countries' ministers of trade, industry and commerce all gathered at the November 1997, COMESA annual summit in Lusaka.

As a result of RESDO/ESA's collaborative efforts, COMESA, in partnership with Zimbabwe and Zambia, has requested the Road Map process. Also, the Executive Secretary of IGAD has formally requested the Road Map be conducted in the Greater Horn tier countries, particularly Eritrea, Djibouti, Ethiopia and Kenya.

During periodic meetings held in Nairobi, Lusaka, and Washington, D.C. last year, the Acting Secretary General of COMESA and REDSO/ESA sought ways to have the region become "investor-friendly" to local and foreign investors. This, in turn, has laid the foundation for partner-driven "creative thinking" to adopt national Road Maps toward a "regional focus." The regional Road Map will identify specific areas for integration and harmonization of policies and procedures related to investment. This idea has been captured by COMESA and submitted to REDSO/ESA as a proposal for African Trade and Investment Policy ATRIP funds.   This will assist COMESA to harmonize procedures for doing business in a market of over 300 million people.

IR2.3: Enhanced Dissemination of Critical Regional Development Information

The Basis for a New Program for Partnership: COMESA and ESABO's Information Mission to the United States and AABA Capacity Building

To further enhance the dissemination of critical regional information, REDSO/ESA embarked on a campaign to introduce COMESA and ESABO to critical decision-makers in the U.S.   This is a culmination of three years of strategic partnership-building that has provided an African-led process that seeks to influence a new relationship between the United States and Africa.

One event that sprang from REDSO/ESA's partnership building was a COMESA/ESABO trade Mission to the U.S. COMESA and ESABO provided Congressional Committees and the American business community with significant information on trade and investment initiatives spearheaded by the African private sector.   These included: 1) the status of significant reductions in tariffs by COMESA member states (See Table 1); and, 2) COMESA and ESABO's initial response to the Africa Growth and Opportunity Act distributed to senior U.S. government officials (USAID, USTR, Department of Commerce and Treasury), the membership of the Corporate Council on Africa (CCA), the American media (Washington Post and the Wall Street Journal) and Congressional leaders responsible for drafting the landmark legislation.

As a result, senior Congressional leaders, American business representatives and U.S. national media have identified COMESA and ESABO as significant future sources of trade information and policy dialogue in the region.

TABLE 1 - COMESA TARIFF REDUCTIONS BY MEMBER STATES*

Member State	Tariff Reduction at end 1997
Angola	No COMESA tariffs published
Burundi	60% tariff reduction
Comoros	80% tariff reduction
DROC	No COMESA tariffs published
Eritrea	80% tariff reduction
Ethiopia	Three-tier Preferential Trade Area (PTA) tariffs published
Kenya	80% tariff reduction
Madagascar	no COMESA tariffs published
Malawi	70% tariff reduction
Mauritius	70% tariff reduction
Namibia	Derogation as part of SACU
Rwanda	60% tariff reduction
Seychelles	Joined COMESA in 1997 - no COMESA tariffs published
Sudan	80% tariff reduction
Swaziland	SACU derogation expired Sept. 1997 - no rates published
Tanzania	Temporarily suspended COMESA tariffs in the June 1997 budget
Uganda	80% tariff reduction
Zambia	60% tariff reduction
Zimbabwe	80% tariff reduction

*COMESA is also working with member States to reduce the number of national tariff bands in existence. Some countries, such as Uganda and Zambia have made impressive progress in reducing the number of non-zero tariff bands to three, with the highest tariffs being 20% to 25% and other countries are working towards the restructuring of their tariff structures.

IR2.4: Increased Regional Collaboration in Addressing Critical Regional Development Issues

The Basis for a New Program for Partnership: COMESA, IGAD AND ESABO

REDSO/ESA's vision for an African-led trade and investment initiative will come about as African organizations develop stronger capacity and collaboration.

Due to REDSO/ESA technical assistance, ESABO was declared the official representative of the East and Southern Africa's business community in all deliberations with COMESA.   This declaration was ratified by COMESA in November 1997.   ESABO represents the first organization comprised of business people that has been asked by an intergovernmental organization to coordinate private sector policy reform in the region.   ESABO's advocacy role has led an activist role in presenting private sector viewpoints on the effects of trade sanctions on Burundi.

Through REDSO/ESA's collaboration, COMESA and IGAD are developing a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU).   This collaboration will further enhance communication with African partners with supportive development agendas in the region.   This will result in greater coordination enhancing the implementation of the GHAI as well as the African Growth and Opportunity Act.

In response to the Africa Trade and Investment Policy (ATRIP), AABA, with the support and assistance of REDSO/ESA, submitted an "Africa-America Business Partnership and Institutional Strengthening Program" proposal to join forces with the CCA.   This creative proposal is about partnership building between two organizations representing African and American corporations and businesses that encourage increased African and U.S. business and investment.   The CCA seeks to expand this concept with ESABO. This supports President Clinton's vision for an equal partnership between American and African businesses.

IR2.5: Strengthened Human and Institutional Capacity to Generate,   Analyze and Use Critical Regional Development Information

The Basis for a New Program for Partnership: ESABO, AABA AND COMESA
AABA and ESABO are newly formed organizations that are developing membership services that will attract increased business investment in their organizations. REDSO/ESA has developed strategic plans with these partners to develop and strengthen their informational, managerial and financial institutional capacity; along with a strategy to attract funding for the development of focus services to meet the needs of its diverse memberships. Nevertheless, in order to jump start these services, REDSO/ESA will undertake an innovative series of approaches that will allow AABA and ESABO to be service providers to donor and intergovernmental organizations such as COMESA and IGAD.

AABA and ESABO will be expected to provide information services, to COMESA and IGAD that many contractors have traditionally provided USAID and other donors, as an innovative method to increase revenues and capacity of these respective organizations.

Managing for Results/ Lessons Learned

Lesson learned is that we should always develop a program in collaboration with African partners who are taking leadership roles in developing regional agendas that are in in line with the strategic goals of the U.S. government and USAID. This is particularly important with the implementation of GHAI.

With the adjustment in REDSO/ESA's program objectives, the economic growth/private sector team will need to forge closer programmatic relationships with missions in the region to link REDSO/ESA's new strategic objective to other missions, bilateral programs and GHAI.   This will include linkages with IGAD, as well as the Regional Center for Southern Africa (RCSA), AFR/SD, USAID/G, international donors and other African partners.

The New Partnership will require a brand new way of communicating fast-moving developments that characterize recent economic growth and private sector opportunities in the region.   The new economic growth/private sector team is developing a creative communications campaign utilizing the internet and REDSO/ESA's newly formed Global Information Infrastructure group (GII).

The present SO #2 strategic framework for economic growth/private sector (EG/PS) program activities is inadequate. The REDSO/ESA EG/PS strategic objective team in expected to operate under a more clearly defined, focused and "results oriented" SO results framework as follows:

SO #1: A MORE OPEN AND MARKET-DRIVEN REGIONAL ECONOMY

IR1: Build Capacity of partner Organizations that Support Regional Integration

IR2: Generate an Enabling Environment for Private Sector Led Growth

> **Sub-IR2.1:** Accelerate Public Policy Reform and Simplify Procedures that Encourage Regional Trade and Food Security

IR3: Promote and Strengthen Transnational Trade and Business Linkages for the Region.

New Agriculture and Food Security Strategic Objective (SO)

Overview and Factors Affecting Program Performance

The Agency, in recognition of the critical importance of agriculture to the success of its development assistance programs, recently revised its economic growth goal in the new Agency Strategic Framework to explicitly address agriculture. REDSO/ESA is likewise adjusting its Strategic Framework to specifically incorporate a results framework for agriculture and food security. In this R4, reporting on activities in the agriculture sector are included under SO #2: *Increased Use of Critical Information by USAID and Other Decision-makers in the ESA Region.*

REDSO/ESA's support of regional agricultural commodity research networks links directly to **Agency Goal #1: Broad-Based Economic Growth Achieved and Agricultural Development Encouraged** by improving research planning and implementation and transfer of technology to agricultural producers and processors. It is also cross-cutting in its support to the Agency Goals that support sustainable environment (#5), and lives saved and suffering reduced (#6).

With respect to Agency Goal #5, REDSO/ESA through its support to regional research plays a major role in developing agricultural practices that are environmentally sustainable and have a positive impact on the environment. This work includes developing soil and fertility conservation techniques and also entails the protection of bio-diversity via the collection and maintenance of seed banks of selected domestic crops and related wild species.

For Agency Goal #6, disease and pest resistant varieties released as a result of USAID supported research has significantly reduced hunger in the region. The availability of seed banks maintained by regional research networks, for example, serve to re-initiate production following seed loss due to civil strife or natural disaster. These banks play a major role in reducing hunger and suffering as was demonstrated by the rapid availability of new planting stock for Rwandan farmers, following seed losses as a result of the internal civil strife that displaced many people from their land.

Progress Towards the Strategic Objective #2

REDSO/ESA, in collaboration with the Global Bureau and AFR/SD, and in support of the Greater Horn of Africa Initiative, has succeeded in creating a regional capacity for planning and implementing agricultural research that is African-owned. In addition, the research is impact oriented and developed in partnership with a broad coalition of technology users, outreach organizations and private generators of technology for agricultural production and processing. Support to ASARECA, a regional agricultural research oversight body representing 10 countries in the East and Central African Region, has resulted in the development and approval by all stakeholders of a regional strategy that places a priority on demand driven research that focuses on the development of technologies that can be readily adopted and will provide increased sustainable and equitable economic growth.

Progress Toward Intermediate Results

IR2.1: Improved Availability Of Regional Information In Priority Development Areas.

The ASARECA agricultural research strategy is being implemented via the Regional Agricultural Research Networks which operate in 10 countries in East and Central Africa. USAID support to these networks has resulted in increased food security and enhanced economic development for thousands of farmers who depend upon agriculture for their livelihood. In 1997, for example, mosaic resistant cassava varieties developed by the East African Root crop Network (EARNET) were newly cultivated on 80,000 hectares in areas of Uganda where cassava production, a major staple food crop had virtually ceased due to mosaic. The families benefitting from this achievement are those living in areas that are most often affected by food insecurity. The economic value of this achievement alone is conservatively estimated at $2,800,000/year. This example is for just one country. These new varieties will continue to spread rapidly in Uganda, Western Kenya and Tanzania as the mosaic continues to devastate traditional cassava varieties in the region.

The Networks potato research has been equally rewarding. Potatoes are a major staple and cash crop grown primarily by small farmers on on nearly 200,000 thousand hectares, in seven countries in the East and Central African subregion. The evaluation of the Networks completed in 1997, found that PRAPACE (Programme Régional d'Amélioration de la Culture de la Pomme de Terre en Afrique Central et de l'Est) had developed potato varieties with resistance to late blight that are providing a yield increase of 2.8 tons per hectare and are being widely adopted throughout the region. In Uganda alone, the improved varieties are growing on an estimated area of 55,000 hectares, reducing the level of food insecurity in one of Africa's poorest countries.

> **Introduction of Agricultural Technologies**
>
> Through the agricultural research networks, REDSO/ESA has introduceed into the region several agricultural technologies, including germplasm that contributes to small scale farmers' food security. Examples include: mosaic tolerant cassava; climbing beans; bacterial wilt tolerant potatoes; and, weevil and mosaic tolerant sweet potatoes. Other technologies introduced include: seed multiplication systems; seed banks; and, post harvest crop storage/handling. The high cost of technology introductions are more effectively accomplished regionally rather than bilaterally. An estimate of the significant import costs saved as a result of these technologies will soon

The evaluation of the Networks further found that in 1995, varieties of Climbing Beans developed by the East and Central Africa Bean Network were being grown by 47% of Rwandan farmers and that the technology is in demand and sustainable even in times of severe economic stress. Use of the technology cuts across income groups, farm size and gender. This technology is now spreading from Rwanda into neighboring Burundi, Uganda and Kenya.

The regional research networks not only develop new and improved varieties, they maintain seed banks and facilitate access to seeds stored in member countries. This function has played an important role in enhancing regional food security. Access to the regional commodity networks'

seed banks enabled Rwanda to rapidly resume production of potatoes and beans in places where seeds had been lost due to internal civil strife.   In spite of floods and droughts in some regions of the country in 1997, food production in Rwanda has reached 85% of pre-war levels.   For 1997, potato production is estimated to be 133,500 metric tons, approaching the pre-war level of 150,000 metric tons/year. Bean production has reached over 90,000 metric tons compared to 135,700 metric tons/year before the war.

IR.2 Improved Models and Technologies for Use in Priority Development Areas

REDSO/ESA, in collaboration with AFR/SD and the Greater Horn of Africa Initiative, has provided strategic planning models to ASARECA and the regional agricultural research networks.   These models provide a forum and methodology for changing the focus of agriculture research.   In the past, agriculture research focused on providing technological solutions to production problems.   The current planning models, financed by USAID, assist researchers in identifying opportunities where technology will have the highest possibilities of adoption and pay off. Regional researchers are beginning to develop programs that involve their clients and stakeholders in determining the research activities that are most responsive to their needs. The use of these models will greatly increase the efficiency of resource use by reducing the amounts spent on technologies which are not suitable for adoption.

> **Facilitating Partnerships in Technology Development, Transfer and Utilization**
>
> REDSO/ESA contributed to an enabling environment that is facilitating partnership development and growth to promote regional technology development, transfer and utilization. Use of seed banks maintained by the research networks and other development partners substantially contributed to the re-establishment of the post-genocide Rwandan farming system, some areas' production reaching 85% of pre-war levels.   Through the REDSO/ESA's efforts, ASARECA and IGAD have started collaborating on the

REDSO/ESA is supporting this change in focus through support to the Technology Transfer Project. Funding for this project is a combined effort of GHAI, Global Bureau and REDSO/ESA. ASARECA and the International Potato Center CIP are jointly responsible for the management of this project. The principal objective of the project is to increase technology transfer by producing models of partnership between public research/extension institutions and private outreach and producers/processors. The first phase of this project has already produced commendable results. One example of the fourteen grants which have been successfully implemented is the dissemination of a new sweet potato flour for baking, a technology developed by the regional research network for potatoes and sweet potatoes PRAPACE.

To further test and promote this new technology, the Technology Transfer Project funded a partnership that included PRAPACE, the Tanzanian Agricultural Research Center, the Tanzanian University of Agriculture, two women's associations and a private bakery.   This partnership typifies the kinds of public/private partnership that USAID is promoting to favor market-led technology development.   Success with this technology will be important to many families in the

sweet potato growing regions of East and Central Africa because sweet potatoes are a major source of income for women farmers.   The successful dissemination of this new technology will provide value added to this commodity, prevent losses encountered in storage because fresh sweet potatoes have a short storage life and increase women's access to income.

REDSO/ESA's contribution to work in rinderpest control is another excellent example of improved models and technologies used to address development problems in the region. Rinderpest is a potentially devastating disease that effects both cattle and certain related species of wildlife. The East Africa region has 95 million head of cattle that are the major source of livelihood and food security for millions of pastoralists in the region. A major outbreak in Africa in the 1980's resulted in the loss of more than $2 billion worth of cattle. More recently, outbreaks in Kenya and Tanzania have decimated herds of Buffalo and Lesser Kudu.

REDSO/ESA, in collaboration with the Global Bureau, provides oversight to the Pan African Rinderpest Campaign that is funded by USAID and the European Union.   This campaign is dependent on a health care delivery model which combines, under the oversight of public livestock services, the services of private veterinarians and community-based animal health workers for surveillance and treatment of disease outbreaks and the implementation of vaccination campaigns. This model, developed by Tufts University under a grant from USAID, has been particularly successful where state services are lacking. In Sudan, for example, this model has been successfully used in combating a major rinderpest outbreak. Currently, 563 community-based health workers in Southern Sudan vaccinate one million animals annually preventing a major spread of the disease to neighboring countries. Using this same model in Somalia, veterinarians worked with community-based animal health workers to vaccinate 227,000 animals in 1997. This community-based model for controlling rinderpest would not have been feasible without the existence of a vaccine that did not require cold storage. Tuft, with a grant from USAID, developed a "thermo-stable" vaccine, produced under a joint public/private venture in Botswana. This vaccine continues to be the major contributing factor to controlling rinderpest in East Africa. USAID is also supporting the development of a recombinant (genetically engineered) vaccine which could prove to be even more efficient.   Work on this vaccine is now being field tested.

IR4: Increased Regional Collaboration in Addressing Critical Regional Development Issues

REDSO/ESA, in conjunction with the Greater Horn of Africa Initiative, successfully brought together 60 stakeholder organizations to review and approve the agricultural strategy developed by ASARECA, the regional oversight body for agricultural research.   This meeting initiated dialogue between ASARECA, and regional organizations such as IGAD, non-government organizations, donors, national agricultural research institutions and farmer associations.

Strengthening ASARECA

REDSO/ESA facilitated and accelerated the strengthening of this regional umbrella research coordinating body. Its governing body has approved its operational and research strategy. The ASARECA strategy supports market-oriented research, supporting the development of effective tools such as Impact Assessment and Policy Analysis capacity. This is a major agricultural research orientation shift.

A subsequent meeting held to discuss funding and implementation of the regional research strategy resulted in IGAD agreeing to advocate policy changes identified by ASARECA as obstacles to technology transfer. The collaboration between ASARECA and IGAD has resulted in a decision by the European Union EU to conduct, with USAID participation, an appraisal of ASARECA's proposed regional research program to determine possible areas for EU funding.

IR5: Strengthened Human and Institutional Capacity to Generate, Analyze and use Critical Regional Development Information

Institutional capacity building is a critical component of USAID's support to agriculture research and development in the ESA region. In 1997, under the auspices of ASARECA and with the support of AFR/SD, GHAI and REDSO/ESA, the Eastern and Central Africa Program for Agricultural Policy Analysis (ECAPAPA) was initiated. The purpose of this program is to develop regional institutional capacity to identify, analyze and eliminate policy constraints to the development of agriculture in the region.   Primary stakeholders have been identified and an initial work plan that identifies a possible policy agenda and at least 12 collaborating institutions has been completed.   This program will play a vital role in assisting countries in East and Central Africa to enhance the performance of agriculture in the region by identifying and changing policies which inhibit agriculture-related trade and production.   Improved performance of agriculture is vital to economic development throughout Africa.   Depending on the country, agriculture employs between 70% and 90 % of the population; its contribution to GDP ranges from 29% to 60%; and it accounts for 66% to 100% of exports.   It is therefore easy to understand why support to human and institutional capacity building is critical.

Managing For Results/Lessons Learned

REDSO/ESA is assuming management responsibility for implementation of the GHAI Strategy as well as a number of activities that were previously managed by USAID Washington.   More effective management of these activities can be achieved by placing them within a strategic framework which better defines results and management accountability.   A clearer strategic framework will also facilitate our partner's desire to better understand what is to be achieved.

With these factors in mind, the Mission has created an SO team for agriculture and food security. The initial phases of SO formation have been completed. The revised strategic objective framework is as follows:

The revised strategic framework will draw upon existing activities and partnerships to obtain strategic cohesion, focus and a sound institutional structure for REDSO/ESA agricultural activities. REDSO/ESA principal partner will be ASARECA. Initial work done by AFR/SD serves as the basis for the revised strategic framework. Subsequent development of the agriculture and food security strategy, especially as part of the GHAI Strategy, has helped to further develop and broaden the teams focus.

This revised Strategic Objective Framework will require a redefinition of the roles and responsibilities of REDSO and its Agency partners, including Global Bureau and AFR/SD. REDSO/ESA currently shares the management of many of these activities with these partners. REDSO/ESA management will focus on redefining these roles over the next reporting period.

> **SO #3:** **Market-Oriented Agricultural Technologies and Policies Adopted to Enhance Regional Food Security.**
>
> **IR 3.1:** **Application of Improved Technologies.**
>
> **IR 3.2:** **Long-term Strategic Partnerships Formed to Develop, Disseminate and Apply Improved Agricultural Technologies and Policies.**
>
> **IR 3.3:** **Market-Oriented Agricultural Production and Marketing Policies Implemented**.

Completion of the strategy refocussing, including the results framework, performance monitoring plan, and organization of results packages and their teams, is expected to be complete by August 1998.

SO #2: Environment and Natural Resources

Strategic Objective #2: Environment and Natural Resources

Performance Analysis

During FY 96 and FY 97, Environment and Natural Resources Management (E/NRM) was a lower ranked program focus area for REDSO's Strategic Objective #2. By the end of FY 97, elimination of the natural resources component of Strategic Objective #2 appeared imminent. The approval of the GHAI Strategy and the subsequent decision to modify the REDSO Strategic Framework have resulted in a decision to reassess the potential role for REDSO in Natural Resources Management. For the first time, a firm mandate for engagement in this critical Agency Goal area has been established in REDSO.

In spite of the uncertainty and limited resources that plagued the E/NRM program in 1997, REDSO surpassed its established program targets.

Progress Towards Intermediate Results

IR 2.1 Improved Availability of Regional Information in Priority Development Areas

The REDSO/ESA funded stakeholder analysis, which reported on the linkages between food security and environment in Uganda, Ethiopia, Eritrea, Somalia, Kenya, and Tanzania, constituted the core of information used for the recently held **Workshop on Food Security and Environmental Linkages in the Greater Horn of Africa.** The analysis, which was conducted by IUCN/WRI, includes: a comprehensive list of stakeholders and partners in the E/NRM arena in the GHA region; several assessments of **food security and the environment in the Greater Horn of Africa**; and an **analysis of transboundary and food security issues in the marine environment in the northwestern Indian Ocean**. In addition, IUCN has completed a study of the **Trade in Wildlife and Medicinals in East and Southern Africa,** the final component of a REDSO/ESA analytical agenda which started in 1995.

A significant FY 97 REDSO/ESA contribution to both the Africa region and USAID Title II activities worldwide is the development of the PL 480, Title II **Environmental Documentation Manual**, a step-by-step guide to compliance with USAID's environmental procedures. REDSO/ESA is the primary author of this document, conceived subsequent to the February 1997 Environmental Assessment (EA) course for Ethiopia's Title II cooperating sponsors. Known initially as the **"Environmental Information Package,"** this guide was developed through collaboration with the Office of Bureau for Humanitarian Response's Food for Peace (BHR/FFP) and AFR/SD, as well as the Environmental Working Groups organized by Food Aid Management (FAM) and USAID/Ethiopia. REDSO/ESA successfully tested the Environmental Documentation Manual with 50 Title II partners in December 1997. This comprehensive tool explains USAID's environmental procedures and has important ramifications beyond Title II. It can be used with a little adaptation by Mission Environmental Officers, SO Teams and others with Regulation 216 responsibilities.

IR 2.4 Increased Regional Collaboration in Addressing Critical Development Issues

In February 1998, REDSO/ESA sponsored a regional workshop on **Food Security and Environmental Linkages in the Greater Horn of Africa**, that brought together 70 stakeholders from Kenya, Uganda, Ethiopia, Tanzania, Somalia and Eritrea.   The objective of the workshop was to identify priority environmental actions which could enhance food security.   At the end of the three-day workshop, the participants agreed on 13 sectoral and eight cross-cutting recommendations (summarized in Text Boxes).   The recommendations from the workshop have helped to shape the development of REDSO/ESA's revamped E/NRM results framework.

IR 2.5 Strengthened Human and Institutional Capacity to Generate, Analyze, and Use Critical Regional Development Information.

REDSO/ESA, in collaboration with AFR/SD/PSGE, is a major provider of   EA Training for PVO/NGOs working in Africa. The EA training is designed to equip nongovernmental organizations (NGOs) and private voluntary organizations (PVOs) with the capacity to design environmentally-sound activities and conduct environmental reviews.   Since FY 1995, REDSO/ESA has conducted EA training courses in Mozambique, Uganda, Tanzania, Madagascar, Ethiopia, Kenya, Mali and follow-up training in Zimbabwe.   In November 1997, REDSO/ESA, in partnership with the Kenya Wildlife Service (KWS), conducted EA training for wildlife managers

---

**Recommendations
Stakeholder Workshop**

▸ Pastoral-wildlife systems
  * Determine contributions to economies and food security of pastoral-wildlife systems
  * Quantify consequences of trends affecting key resource areas

▸ Support effective dialogue between pastoralists and governments
  * Conduct disease prevalence base-line study as a step to develop strategic disease control program

▸ Freshwater resources
  * Build institutional capacity
  * Determine distribution, value, and functions of wetlands and waer systems
  * Develop feasiblemodels for transboundary watershed management
  * Determine extent of ground water resources

▸ Marine and coastal resources
  * Empower local communiteis through capacity building and policy reform
  * Support pilot project on integrated coastal zone management and share lessons learned
  * Strengthen capacity of regional institutions

▸ Farming systems
  * Strengthen forecasting capacity
  * Promote farmer-farmer exchange visits
  * Improve access to market information

---

and community mobilizers.   The week-long course was attended by 40 participants.   The enthusiasm created by the course for EA led to the creation of a task force to institutionalize environmental impact assessment procedures within KWS.   The Ethiopia course was a pilot training effort for PL 480, Title II partners.

In total, since 1995, REDSO/ESA has been instrumental in training, over 340 NGOs and PVOs in environmentally-sound design and impact assessments, 166 of them in FY 97. The training has also supported three to five Africans per course as facilitators/trainers, thus building enhanced host country capacity in environmental impact assessment. Partners are now applying environmental review procedures, and some individuals have sought additional training in the subject.

Managing for Results - Lessons Learned

Currently, REDSO/ESA's E/NRM activities fall under the all encompassing Strategic Objective 2: **Increased Utilization of Critical Information by USAID and Other Decisionmakers in the region**. Whereas this SO fosters cross-sectoral fertilization, it also creates serious difficulties in reporting due to the need to have generic indicators. Furthermore, SO #2's results framework does not provide a suitable basis for sectoral strategic planning or program management. These limitations curbed REDSO/ESA's E/NRM staff's ability to take full advantage of the unique "value-added" position derived from REDSO/ESA's regional perspective, experience, contacts and institutional memory. REDSO/ESA has restructured it's E/NRM results framework and is confident it will enhance USAID's ability to contribute to improved management of regional natural resources.

Revised Environment and Natural Resources Management Strategic Objective

SO #5:	**Regional Promotion of Improved E/NRM**
IR1.0:	**Improved African Access to E/NRM Information.**
IR2.0:	**Improved African Capacity to Manage Natural Resources**
IR3.0:	**Informed Regional Dialogue on E/NRM**
IR4.0:	**Effective Support to Bi-lateral E/NRM Programs**

Rationale for Strategic Objective #5

Africa's national borders do not coincide with those of ecological systems. For example, Lake Victoria's watershed spans over Uganda, Kenya, Tanzania and Rwanda; the unparalleled annual Serengeti-Maasai Mara wildebeest migration takes place between the Serengeti in Tanzania and Maasai-Mara in Kenya; transhumant Borana pastoralists utilize rangelands in Kenya, Uganda, and Ethiopia; flamingoes migrate along the string of Rift Valley saline lakes; and, sea turtles that nest in Kenya may feed, and be fed upon, in Somalia. Habitat destruction, cross-border poaching and

cross-border grazing of disease carrying wildlife and livestock are just a few examples of how management of these ecosystems requires regional collaboration.   The importance of regional E/NRM problems is illustrated by 11 environmental problems affecting Kenya that call for regional collaboration. (see box)   Accordingly, sustainable management of these resources cannot be achieved without concerted multinational effort.

Joint multinational efforts also offer opportunities that go beyond the solution of problems.   For example, the countries in East Africa harbor complementary tourist attractions. By harmonizing policies and marketing themselves as a region, East Africa could become an unrivaled tourist destination.   In Southern Africa, the creation of transfrontier conservation areas would increase the range for elephants and reduce the degree of habitat destruction being currently experienced in Botswana, South Africa and Zimbabwe, and increase the tourism appeal of the Southern Africa sub-region.   Joint watershed management agreements would serve to preempt tensions over the use of the regions water supply. Thus, a well executed regional program can lead to improved natural resources management, and an improvement in the well being of the region's population.

Within the Greater Horn of Africa region, and throughout East and Southern Africa, there is a recognized need to build both African capacity to conserve and manage the vast natural resources of the region, as well

> **Kenyan Environmental Problems Requiring Regional Collaboration**
>
> ▸   Serengeti-Mara wildebeest migration
> ▸   Flamingo habitat conservation
> ▸   Wildlife-livestock disease control
> ▸   Transfrontier rangelands
> ▸   Cross-border poaching
> ▸   Turtle and fisheries management
> ▸   Lake Victoria, Lake Jipe management
> ▸   Cross-border dynamite fishing
> ▸   Cross-border protected areas
> ▸   Shared watersheds
> ▸   Tourism policies/regulations

as engage in more active collaboration in their management.   Since international boundaries cut indiscriminately across ecosystems, and since many ecosystems in the region have representative units distributed in more than one country, the need for regional collaboration in management and in sharing lessons learned is critical.

Strategic Objective #5 and the GHAI Strategy

Strategic Objective #5 is complementary to the Objectives and results of the **Greater Horn of Africa Initiative Strategic Plan**.   This SO incorporates all the elements of Intermediate Results 1.6 of the GHAI Food Security Strategic Objective.   REDSO/ESA's environment and natural resource management specialists worked with the GHAI strategy team to ensure that the plan addressed the critical links between food security and environmental management throughout the GHA region. This emphasis reflects the fact that environmental issues such as deforestation, land degradation, soil erosion, watershed degradation and a host of other environmental problems in the region have a direct and significant impact on the ability of populations in these areas to maintain food security.

Strategic Objective #5 also links to the GHAI SO# 2 which focuses on conflict in the region. Competition for scarce natural resources often results in conflict in the GHA region. When these occur at a regional level, for example, conflict between pastoralists on the Uganda-Kenya border, the situation becomes even more complex. On the plus side, community-based natural resources management programs that are happening throughout the region are inherently participatory and foster grassroots decisionmaking as well as ownership over natural resources. Efforts to share lessons learned regionally by these programs will have a significant impact on USAID's objectives of more democratic processes in this region.

Development of the results framework

The results framework for E/NRM is grounded on consultation with African stakeholders. First, an institutional stakeholder analysis of the linkages between environment and food security were commissioned for six countries in the Greater Horn of Africa region. The results of these studies were used to structure a three-day stakeholder workshop, with the purpose of identifying regional environmental issues and solutions that can be advantageously addressed from a regional rather than bilateral platform. Sixty-five individuals from eight countries, representing a broad spectrum of institutions associated with agricultural systems, marine and coastal resources, fresh water systems, and pastoral-wildlife systems, attended the workshop. They identified 11 cross-cutting and 13 sub-sector specific recommendations (see text boxes).

The more general cross-cutting recommendations, such as increase information exchange, promote regional collaboration, and build analytical capacity were incorporated in the proposed SO #5 results framework. The sub-sector specific recommendations will assist the SO team developing a responsive results packages.

Nairobi Workshop Cross-cutting Recommendations
‣ Increase information exchange
‣ Promote regional collaboration
‣ Elevate E/NRM analytical capacity
‣ Promote grassroots empowerment
‣ Promote diversification of resource use
‣ Support regional agreements/protocols
‣ Support exchange visits
‣ Foster media and private sector involvement
‣ Promote cross-sectoral planning and policies

The Results Framework
Strategic Obejctive #5: Regional promotion of improved natural resources management.

The term *regional* applies to two categories of resources: those that either straddle or move across borders (e.g. shared watersheds, rangelands, migrating animals); and those that are represented in different countries of the region (e.g. mangrove patches, afromontane forests).

SO#5 will be achieved through successful implementation of the following intermediate results:

IR5.1: Increased Access to E/NRM Information by Africans; IR5.2: African Capacity to Analyze and Manage Natural Resources Strengthened; and IR5.3: Informed Regional Dialogue.
Regional dialogue extends to dialogue between organizations and stakeholders based in different

countries.   Support for national level activities will fall under **IR5.4: Effective Support to Bilateral E/NRM Programs.**   The first three intermediate results, are overlapping and mutually reinforcing. Increased access to E/NRM information by Africans (IR5.1) and Africans with the capacity to analyze and manage natural resources (IR5.2) are prerequisites to informed regional negotiations (IR5.3).

IR5.4: Effective Support to Bilateral E/NRM Programs, is a vital catalyst to the process outlined above.   The "value-added" from REDSO/ESA's regional support responsibilities is reflected in the fact that the first stages of the restructured E/NRM program has been developed with a substantial amount of input from regional partners and stakeholders.   Support to bilateral partners will facilitate the SO Team's need to identify regional E/NRM issues, and provide an opportunity for contacts with key African stakeholders.

Expected ProgressThrough FY 2000 and Initial Program Focus:

Responding to the recommendations from the stakeholder analysis, three program areas were chosen: 1) pastoral-wildlife systems; 2) wetlands and water resources; 3) marine and coastal resources.   A fourth area; sustainable agriculture, will be addressed in close collaboration with REDSO/ESA's Strategic Objective 3

Key partners with which a dialogue has been established and options for collaboration explored include the Land Grant U.S. Universities involved in the Global Livestock Collaborative Research Support Program and the United States Geological Survey.   Existing USAID efforts, such as AFRICALINK and the Leyland initiative will be tapped to assist the strategic objective team link African stakeholders electronically.   The team will collaborate closely with REDSO/ESA's own Global Information Infrastructure Unit (GII).

The team will collaborate with ongoing efforts to elevate the capacity of regional organizations. Prime examples include the multi-donor GHAI-led endeavor to raise the capacity of IGAD; the World Bank-assisted Regional Secretariat for the Lake Victoria Environmental Management Program; the Swedish-backed Secretariat for East African Coastal Area Management (SEACAM); the Western Indian Ocean Marine Scientists Organization (WIOMSA); the Organization of African Union's Pan African Rinderpest Campaign; the Pastoral and Environmental Network for the Horn of Africa (PENHA); and, the Association for Strengthening Agricultural Research in Eastern and Central Africa (ASARECA).

The SO #5 team will work with African organizations to usher informed negotiations between stakeholders. These organizations will range from inter-governmental institutions such as IGAD, the Organization of African Unity (OAU), the East African Cooperation (EAC); to selected African and international NGOs.   When deemed appropriate, U.S institutions will be involved in guiding this dialogue by assisting with the generation of information and the strategic provision of facilitation services.

Performance Data Tables: SO #2

OBJECTIVE: SO #2 Increased Utilization of Critical Information by USAID and other Decisionmakers in the region--Environment and Natural Resources
APPROVED: 1995 **COUNTRY/ORGANIZATION:** REDSO/ESA

RESULT NAME: IR 2.4: Increased Regional Collaboration in Addressing Critical Development Issues

INDICATOR: Number of stakeholders collaborating in intra-regional events

UNIT OF MEASURE: Number of decision-makers	YEAR	PLANNED	ACTUAL
SOURCE: Workshop reports	96	4	6
INDICATOR DESCRIPTION: Decisionmakers and practitioners in E/NRM from GHA region	97	50	70
COMMENTS: Stakeholders agreed on a clear set of priority E/NRM issues. Their input guided development of current Results Framework. This indicator and IR will no longer be applicable to REDSO/ESA's E/NRM SO.	98		

OBJECTIVE: SO #2 Increased Utilization of Critical Information by USAID and other decision-makers in the region--Environment and Natural Resources
APPROVED: 1995   **COUNTRY/ORGANIZATION:** USAID/REDSO/ESA

RESULT NAME: IR 2.5: Strengthened human and institutional capacity to generate, analyze, and use critical regional development information

INDICATOR: Number of African stakeholders generating analyzing, or using critical regional development information

UNIT OF MEASURE: Number of trainees	YEAR	PLANNED	ACTUAL
SOURCE: Course participants list	1995	40	50
INDICATOR DESCRIPTION: Individuals receiving training in Environmental Assessment			
COMMENTS: Trained provided as part of Environmental Assessment Training Courses. Participants from PVO/NGO organizations, private sector	1996	80	126
USAID and government institutions.	1997	100	166

Strategic Objective #3: Establish a Strong Basis for Implementation of the Greater Horn of Africa Initiative (GHAI)

Strategic Objective #3: Establish a Strong Basis for Implementation of the Greater Horn of Africa Initiative (GHAI)

Performance Analysis

REDSO/ESA is very pleased to report that it has achieved its Strategic Objective Three (SO #3). The development and approval of the GHAI Strategic Plan, REDSO/ESA's decision to restructure, and the ongoing technical assistance provided by team members, has created an enabling environment for the GHAI within USAID (IR3.1). Through the Horn of Africa Support Project (HASP), SO #3 met its indicator targets for the strengthening of GHA regional African capacity in food security (FS) and conflict prevention, mitigation and response (CPMR), but also learned valuable lessons to apply to the formulation of the GHAI Strategic Plan.

A primary tool for establishing a strong basis for implementation of the GHAI has been the HASP, a grant agreement with one of the GHAI's key African partners, IGAD. IGAD's membership includes seven of the 10 GHA countries (Djibouti, Eritrea, Kenya, Rwanda, Somalia, Sudan, Tanzania, Uganda). Through the HASP, two mechanisms for enhancing regional strategic coordination (an SO-level indicator) have been established and are being effectively implemented. Central among these is the institution of systematic technical-level consultative meetings among members of the Joint IGAD Partners Forum (JIPF), a coordination structure involving nine donor governments, the seven IGAD member states, and the IGAD Secretariat. This Forum has the potential for becoming an important vehicle for regional collaboration on a variety of funding and policy issues related to food security and conflict prevention, mitigation and response. In addition, SO #3 played a leadership role in developing a USAID Agency-wide technical coordination structure to support our work with IGAD.

SO #3 also met its IR3.1 indicator targets, helping to establish an enabling environment for the GHAI within USAID through its application of the GHAI operating principles, both within the HASP as well as in its other activities. In collaboration with the GHAI Transitions Team, SO #3 arranged for training in linking relief and development for more than 100 USAID staff and partners - which will take place in Nairobi in April of this year. SO #3 team members also assisted in the development of three Integrated Strategic Plans (ISPs), a GHAI-conceived tool for helping Missions apply the five GHAI operating principles to their country programs.

SO #3 met its IR3.2 and IR3.3 indicator targets, strengthening five African institutions which manage regional activities in FS and CPMR activities. These institutions received financial, institution-strengthening or sector-specific technical assistance. SO #3 also established the means to support capacity building for up to 40 additional institutions in future years through the development of a HASP-funded regional institutional strengthening/grantmaking program for African organizations. Central to this program will be results which strengthen African capacity in FS and CPMR, reflect the GHAI principles and incorporate gender and environmental considerations.

An enabling environment was also established through the creation of the GHAI Strategic Plan. Drawing on experience to date, as well as its extensive development partnerships in the region, SO

#3 formalized the concepts and accomplishments to date of the GHAI in the preparation of a five-year GHAI Strategic Plan which was approved in October 1997.

The GHAI Strategic Plan addresses the region's history of chronic food insecurity and civil instability in the 10 countries of the GHA region through its two Strategic Objectives - SO#1: Strengthened African Capacity to Enhance Regional Food Security and SO#2: Strengthened African Capacity to Prevent, Mitigate and Respond to Conflict.   With its emphasis on strengthening African capacity, the GHAI will focus on strengthening partnerships among nongovernmental organizations, business associations, community groups and regional governments.   Through its strategic objectives, the GHAI embodies U.S. national interests in the region as reflected in several of the Strategic Plan for International Affairs (SPIA) strategies.   For example, the GHAI seeks to prevent or minimize the human costs of conflict and natural disasters, to promote broad-based economic growth in developing and transitional economies, and to open foreign markets to free the flow of goods, services and capital.

Through Special Objective (SPO #3): Improved Access to Analytical Information, the GHAI Strategic Plan incorporated the feedback received from numerous customers which stressed the need for an "information transfer" from donors to Africans, if development impacts are to be sustainable. This SPO also includes an innovative monitoring and evaluation component which will be implemented in collaboration with African partners to assess not only achievement of results under the GHAI, but also progress toward applying the operating principles.

As a last step in establishing a strong basis for implementation of the GHAI, REDSO/ESA has embarked on a restructuring exercise which will marry the GHAI Strategic Plan with the results achieved to date by all of REDSO/ESA's SO Teams. Under REDSO/ESA's new structure, the GHAI will be fully integrated into six new Strategic Objective Teams, each of which will have responsibilities for achieving the results and objectives of the GHAI. In sum, REDSO/ESA's existing SO #3 has been achieved and REDSO/ESA is preparing for the next phase of the GHAI, implementation of the approved strategy.

Progress Toward Intermediate Results

As noted in last year's R4, SO #3 planned to revise its IRs and indicators for FY 97 based on lessons learned and development of the GHAI Strategy. Given that the development of the GHAI Strategy was a "work in progress" during FY 97, SO #3 need established "provisional" IRs and indicators as a basis for tracking progress.   These IRs and indicators serve as the basis for this year's R4, and the lessons learned from this framework were applied to GHAI strategy formulation. For example, despite having achieved indicator targets over the past year, it became clear that targets set for IRs related to strengthening African capacity were at far too high a level. Indeed, SO #3's IR3.2 and IR3.2 are nearly identical to the strategic objectives of the approved GHAI Strategy.

IR3.1 Enabling Environment for GHAI Created Within USAID in the Region

SO #3 provided technical assistance to USAID/Rwanda, USAID/Eritrea and REDSO/ESA's Sudan Field Office in the preparation of their Integrated Strategic Plans (ISPs). The ISP process is meant to facilitate application of the GHAI operating principles which include African ownership, strategic coordination, linking relief and development (LRD), regional approaches and promoting stability. To assist Missions in understanding and applying these principles to their country programs, SO #3 collaborated with the GHAI Transitions Team and Office of Foreign Disaster Assistance (OFDA) to provide country-based LRD training to USAID/Rwanda and the Sudan Field Office in advance of their ISP design.

Given the success of the LRD training at the bilateral level, SO #3 again collaborated with the GHAI Transitions Team to arrange for LRD training of more than 100 persons in the coming year. Targeted to USAID staff and their partners in the region, this training will be co-hosted by REDSO/ESA and USAID/Kenya and will include a "training of trainers" component.

SO #3 also coordinated the development of the GHAI Strategic Plan, a challenging undertaking requiring collaboration with numerous partners. Customers and partners included not only a wide range of African institutions in the region, but also each U.S. Government unit associated with the Initiative. In addition to consultations with regional partners held by REDSO/ESA, bilateral Missions in the region were also asked to consult with partners throughout the process of strategy formulation. Partners' input led directly to the formulation of the final strategic objective statements, and is also reflected in the intermediate results and illustrative activities put forth in the Strategic Plan. The Plan was approved by the USAID Administrator in October 1997, and REDSO/ESA is now fully engaged in preparing for strategy implementation. The GHAI strategic objectives will be fully integrated into REDSO/ESA's new structure, creating an enabling environment for the GHAI within REDSO/ESA.

IR3.2 Strengthened African Capacity to Achieve Regional Food Security

SO #3 strengthened several key regional African institutions in their efforts to achieve regional food security. SO #3 support to IGAD has established a foundation for the effective implementation of all of IGAD's food security programs. A regional institutional strengthening and grantmaking program was established to support capacity building in a broad set of African institutions. Support to IGAD includes:

▸   SO #3 provided extensive institutional strengthening assistance to IGAD in the form of information technology upgrades, particularly the development of a Local Area Network. By tackling this priority need, SO #3 helped establish IGAD's Regional Integrated Information System (RIIS). This system will provide critical information to African policymakers in the GHA region on food security, disaster, environmental and natural resource management issues.

▸   SO #3 facilitated a dialogue in the region among various technical organizations to clarify and define IGAD's FS projects and the appropriate role of each organization. Extensive consultations on drought-resistant crop and livestock development projects were facilitated between IGAD,

international donors and regional technical organizations, including ASARECA and the Organization for African Unity (OAU/IBAR).

▸   In collaboration with USAID/W, SO #3 helped coordinate a dialogue between IGAD, its seven member states, and the international donor community on the development of a Food Aid Code for the GHA region which, if approved, will tie into the Global Food Aid Code under the Rome World Food Summit.

▸   REDSO/ESA assumed management (from Global Bureau) of a no-cost extension for the Greater Horn Electronic Communications Network Grant to the Pan African Development Information System (PADIS).   The extension enabled PADIS to complete its objective of establishing electronic connections through e-mail and Internet hook-ups in the GHA region.   All the equipment has been procured and the Canadian Government has agreed to fund all training activities of the Government Ministries on the use of e-mail and Internet.

Distinct from support for IGAD's work, the SO #3 Team designed an innovative $10 million regional institutional strengthening and grantmaking program which will focus on supporting African NGOs undertaking innovative and relevant regional food security activities (as well as CPMR activities).   The program will be managed and funded under the HASP and will become operational in FY 98.   It will respond to the agendas set out by African NGOs, broadly defined to include PVOs, sector networks and consortia, policy/research institutes, and professional/trade associations. A key result of the program will be the strengthening of food security-related sectoral networks in the 10-country GHA region.

Finally, several other GHAI-sponsored regional food security activities were also supported. HASP funded a conference and annual planning meeting of the ESABO which focused on the private sector's role in food security. Support was also provided for strategic planning activities of the ASARECA, contributing to the completion of a regional strategic plan for agricultural research, extension and policy development.   SO #3 also assisted the Ethiopian Institute for Peace and Development in organizing a Regional Economic Integration conference.

IR3.3 Strengthened Regional African Capacity for Conflict Prevention, Mitigation and Response

SO #3's support to IGAD led to strengthened regional African capacity for conflict prevention, mitigation, and response.   IGAD continued its efforts to act upon its expanded charter mandate for regional peace and reconciliation issues.   In support of IGAD's continued progress toward becoming a respected and influential intergovernmental organization, SO #3 provided a widerange of institutional strengthening and sector-specific technical assistance to the IGAD Secretariat.

▸   SO #3 supported the development of IGAD's Peace Fund, a quick response conflict management mechanism which will facilitate IGAD's increasingly critical role in mediating and preventing conflicts in the region.   This Fund has received support from over five donors, including

a pledge of $200,000 from the HASP. IGAD-sponsored talks related to Somalia and Sudan have already resulted in small but significant progress in bringing the various sides of the conflicts together.

▸ SO #3's support for strengthening the institutional capacity of the IGAD Secretariat will also facilitate IGAD's efforts in CPMR. One of the most significant accomplishments was the authorization IGAD's Secretariat to contract directly with USAID funds for needed goods and services in support of its work in CPMR (as well as FS). This contracting authority represents an unusual level of confidence by the USG for indigenous organizations.

As mentioned previously, the HASP institutional strengthening and grantmaking program (ISGM) will build the capacity and support regional activities of up to 40 additional African NGOs engaged in CPMR (as well as food security). It will include the establishment or strengthening of 5-10 regional sector and sub-sector networks to promote strategic coordination and inter-organizational partnerships. The anticipated CPMR-related results of this program are no less significant than those expected from the work with IGAD. Several key components of the ISGM are worth noting:

▸ Support to African ownership. The ISGM will flexibly respond to African agendas because the specific activities it supports are not pre-determined. This is considered particularly important in the CPMR area since solutions to peace issues require local solutions and local commitment.

▸ An Advisory Council made up of African citizens representing the diversity of the GHA region in terms of geography, sectors of society and gender, will make the funding recommendations on all ISGM grants.

Managing for Results/Lessons Learned

In addition to making significant progress last year, the SO #3 team also faced a number of challenges.

▸ **SO #3 and the GHAI Strategy:** As noted earlier, SO #3 needed to establish new IRs and indicators without an approved GHAI Strategy. Nevertheless, SO #3's lessons learned, including the pursuit of results under the HASP, were key factors in the development of the GHAI strategy and in REDSO/ESA's decision to restructure. While REDSO/ESA believes a strong basis for implementing the GHAI has been established, two of the provisional IRs described above were far too high, and have become strategic objectives of the approved GHAI Strategy. Reasons for lowering requests are:

▸ **Slow Nature of Partnership:** Strategic coordination and working in partnership with African institutions necessitates a slower, more deliberate process of defining common objectives and collaborative modes of operation. Although this takes time and requires greater patience and flexibility from USAID, SO #3 has been commended for its efforts during FY 97 to build a strong

relationship with its African partners based on transparency, professionalism and genuine partnership.

▸ **Capacity Issues of African Institutions:** USAID programmatic and administrative regulations require external partners to have well-developed capacities in strategic planning, results reporting and administrative/financial management. We must help strengthen the capacity of African institutions in these critical areas. In addition, capacity within the USG as well as the GHA region in the area of CPMR is quite limited. Effective programming in this important area will require appropriate analysis and pilot interventions, as well as a sharing of lessons that exist, an approach reflected in the approved GHAI strategy.

▸ **Challenges Posed by USAID's Policies and Procedures:** USAID's results reporting requirements often make it challenging to find a balance between building the long-term capacity of indigenous regional institutions and showing results in the short-to-medium term. Supporting the development priorities of African partners and not predetermining indicators make it difficult to meet USAID internal reporting timelines. Procurement requirements such as the preference for U.S. goods and services also make African ownership and capacity strengthening difficult. In addition, funding decisions and needed technical assistance have been delayed due to a lack of coordination across USG agencies.

Results from Customer Survey

In developin gthe GHAI Strategy, SO #3 and all of REDSO/ESA's customers were formally and informally surveyed on the priorities and approaches deemed most important and feasible for achieving the goals of the GHAI. Using the original GHAI Concept Paper, lessons learned to date, and subsequent feedback, SO #3 sought to formalize these efforts into a Strategic Plan with clearly defined strategic objectives and intermediate results. One key customer survey result was the overwhelming interest and support from Missions and partners in the region for "doing business differently" through application of the GHAI operating principles which became the "operational framework" for the entire Strategic Plan.

Expected Progress through FY 00

With the achievement of REDSO/ESA's SO #3 and the establishment of a strong basis for implementation of the GHAI, SO #3 will cease to exist. REDSO/ESA's seven new Strategic Objective Teams will assume responsibility for coordinating the achievement of results under the GHAI Strategic Plan. The HASP will continue as a key cross-cutting mechanism which will now support all of REDSO/ESA's new SO Teams. Each Team will utilize the HASP as a tool for incorporating capacity strengthening and strategic coordination into the achievement of their GHAI results.

OBJECTIVE: Establish a Strong Basis for Implementation of the Greater Horn of Africa Initiative

APPROVED: 06/94   **COUNTRY/ORGANIZATION:** USAID/REDSO/ESA

RESULT NAME: N/A

INDICATOR: Mechanisms for Effective Regional Strategic Coordination in Place and Utilized

	YEAR	PLANNED	ACTUAL
UNIT OF MEASURE: Number of mechanisms. **SOURCE:** REDSO/ESA activity reports	1997	2	2
	1998	N/A	
INDICATOR DESCRIPTION: Per last year's R4 submission, this is a revised indicator with new targets.	1999	N/A	
	2000	N/A	
COMMENTS: In FY 97, SO #3 supported two mechanisms to enhance regional strategic coordination. A donor coordination mechanism, known as the Joint IGAD Partners Forum, has been established and through it the USG has played a lead role in coordinating donor support to IGAD. SO #3 also played a leadership role in developing a USAID-wide technical coordination structure to support our work with IGAD. In future, strategic coordination will be central to the work of all of REDSO/ESA's new Teams, including the HASP's Institutional Strengthening and Grantmaking Program.	2001	N/A	

Performance Data Tables: SO #3

OBJECTIVE: Establish a Strong Basis for Implementation of the Greater Horn of Africa Initiative (GHAI)

APPROVED: 6/94   COUNTRY/ORGANIZATION: REDSO/ESA

RESULT NAME: SO #3 IR 3.1: Enabling Environment for GHAI Created Within USAID in the Region

INDICATOR: Number of GHA Missions with Integrated Strategic Plans

UNIT OF MEASURE: Number of Integrated Strategic Plans (ISPs)	YEAR	PLANNED	ACTUAL
SOURCE: REDSO/ESA trip reports and approved ISPs	1997	4	4
INDICATOR DESCRIPTION: Per last year's R4 submission, this is a revised indicator withnew targets.	1998	N/A	
	1999	N/A	
COMMENTS: SO #3 provided technical assistance to USAID/Rwanda, USAID/Eritrea and REDSO/ESA's Sudan Field Office in the preparation of their Integrated Strategic Plans (ISPs). The ISP is a critical planning tool for the GHAI, laying the groundwork for program convergence in the region as well as facilitating application of the GHAI principles and reinforcing USAID's reengineering practices. SO #3 facilitated training in linking relief and development for USAID/Rwanda and the Sudan Field Office, in advance of their ISP exercise.	2000	N/A	
	2001	N/A	
As each Mission in the GHA region comes due for a new strategic plan, the ISP approach will be utilized, with technical assistance provided by REDSO/ESA's new SO Teams.	2002	N/A	
SO #3 also coordinated preparation of the GHAI Strategic Plan, perhaps the most important indicator for this strategic objective. Due to the complexities of the GHAI, this Plan did not attempt to immediately "integrate" all of the USG resources flowing to the GHA region - rather the Plan serves as the "base" document for future USAID programming to which REDSO/ESA, USAID Washington Bureaus, bilateral Missions and possibly other USG entities will contribute in pursuit of program convergence in the region.			

Performance Data Tables SO #3 GHAI

OBJECTIVE: Establish a Strong Basis for Implementation of the Greater Horn of Africa (GHAI)

APPROVED: 6/94 **COUNTRY/ORGANIZATION:** USAID/REDSO/ESA

RESULT NAME: SO #3 IR 3.2 Strengthened African Capacity to Achieve Regional Food Security

INDICATOR: Number of Strengthened African Institutions Working on Regional Food Security

UNIT OF MEASURE: Number of institutions (cumulative)	YEAR	PLANNED	ACTUAL
SOURCE: REDSO/ESA activity reports	1997	5	5
INDICATOR DESCRIPTION: Per last year's R4 submission, this is a revised indicator with new.	1998	N/A	
COMMENTS: Through the HASP, SO #3 strengthened the capacity of several regional African institutions, including IGAD, ASARECA, ESABO, PADIS and EIIPD. With SO #3 support, the	1999	N/A	
IGAD Secretariat established a Local Area Network (LAN) computer system, including purchase of computers and interim support for a LAN Systems Manager. Support for the project design	2000	N/A	
phase for five IGAD project profiles in food security has been pledged which will facilitate IGAD's continuing leadership role in the region. SO #3 also assumed management of a Global Bureau grant to PADIS, completing the activity's objective of establishing electronic connectivity for government ministries in the GHA region.	2001	N/A	
SO #3 supported ESABO and ASARECA with their strategic planning exercises and funded a conference, convened by EIIPD, which identified priorities for regional economic integration.			
Through the HASP Institutional Strengthening and Grantmaking Program, it is anticipated that up to 40 institutions engaged in food security (and CPMR) activities will receive both activity and institutional support.			

OBJECTIVE: Establish a Strong Basis for Implementation of the Greater Horn of Africa Initiative (GHAI)

APPROVED: 6/94   **COUNTRY/ORGANIZATION:** REDSO/ESA

RESULT NAME: SO #3 IR 3.3: Strengthened GHA Region African Capacity for Conflict Prevention, Mitigation, and Response (CPMR)

INDICATOR: Number of Strengthened GHA Region African Institutions Working in CPMR Activities

UNIT OF MEASURE: Number of institutions (cumulative)	YEAR	PLANNED	ACTUAL
SOURCE: REDSO/ESA activity reports	1997	1	1
	1998	N/A	
INDICATOR DESCRIPTION: Per last years' R4 submission, this is a revised indicator with new targets.	1999	N/A	
COMMENTS: In FY 97, SO #3 supported IGAD's development of a Peace Fund for quick response to conflicts in the region, and committed to the	2000	N/A	
design of two of IGAD's project profiles focused on conflict and humanitarian affairs. SO #3 also conducted a thorough review of IGAD's financial systems, which led to IGAD's authority to contract with USAID funds. SO #3 views this authority as a very significant aspect of institutional strengthening, demonstrating the GHAI principle of African ownership, and an encouraging level of USG confidence in indigenous organizations.	2001	N/A	
Through the HASP Institutional Strengthening and Grantmaking Program, it is anticipated that up to 40 institutions engaged in conflict prevention, mitigation and response (and food security) will receive both activity and institutional support.			

Strategic Support Objective (SSO) #4

Strategic Support Objective (SSO)4: More Effective Responses to Humanitarian Crises and Transitions Towards Greater Self-Reliance in the ESA Region

Performance Analysis
SSO #4 exceeded its targets in this reporting period.
An important indicator at the SSO level is **Indicator 4.2:** Percent of major humanitarian assistance interventions operating with an approved USAID strategy to address humanitarian crises. During FY 97/98, our target of 80% of the countries having approved Mission strategies which address major humanitarian crisis has been met. At present, USAID supports major humanitarian interventions in Sudan, Somalia, Rwanda, Burundi and Angola in the ESA region.   Burundi is the only country without a formal approved strategy. BHR/OFDA has prepared a humanitarian assistance strategy for Burundi, however it does not include the limited DA-funded programs.   Recognizing the need for better integration of relief and development resources in Burundi, the SSO #4 team will encourage BHR and AFR/EA to jointly prepare a strategy which integrates relief and development resources. In addition, we will encourage USAID Missions in GHA countries to prepare crisis modifiers for their strategies in order to facilitate a rapid response to potential internal/regional problems which may adversely impact their strategy achievements.

Linkage to GHAI

SSO #4 supports the achievement of objectives of BHR/FFP, BHR/OFDA and the GHAI.   The achievement of SSO #4 can only be accomplished and measured through joint REDSO/ESA, field missions and BHR activities.   SSO #4 and the GHAI strategy are mutually reinforcing.   They recognize the need to address the underlying causes of food insecurity through preparedness and prevention measures, and the importance of linking relief with development by supporting timely recovery and rehabilitation activities.   Also, a strengthened regional capacity to prevent and respond to crisis situations will help re-establish the conditions for political and economic recovery and enhance the potential for achieving broad-based sustainable development.

Progress towards Intermediate Results

IR4.1 - Improved Systems in Place for Planning and Analysis of Crisis in the ESA Region

This IR reflects the importance of having systems in place which provide both timely and relevant information to help local authorities, governments and donors address potential crises before they arise, or design suitable interventions to mitigate ongoing crises.   Members of the SSO #4 team have identified a number of internal constraints which inhibit USAID's ability to carry out more effective humanitarian assistance programs and have been highly successful in getting BHR to remove some of them for grants approved in FY 97/98.   For example, in complex emergencies new vulnerable groups often emerge, requiring urgent food aid. Our emergency food programs have traditionally not permitted contingency reserves, making it impossible to respond to the additional needs of new vulnerable groups on a timely basis. Through dialogue with BHR/FFP, REDSO/ESA was able to get contingency reserves for the emergency food programs in southern Sudan.   In

discussions with our customers and partners, we identified the high probability of increased displacements of vulnerable groups due to increased fighting which occurs during the dry season.

We were also successful in getting BHR/OFDA approval of contingency reserves of non-food items for some grantees. Another constraint recently "removed" is support for innovative regional monetization programs. In FY 97, BHR/FFP approved a pilot regional monetization program for World Vision for northern Uganda/southern Sudan to support transitional food security programs.

Under Indicator 4.1.1: The number of USAID Internal Constraints to Do Business Differently in Humanitarian Crises Removed, the SSO #4 Teams's target was to have two "constraints" removed. We achieved removal of three constraints, allowing us to exceed the planned target.

IR 4.2: Enhanced Target Population Capacity to Re-establish Their Livelihoods Following a Crisis

This IR is a reflection of our belief that humanitarian assistance programs should not create dependency or be considered an entitlement program. Vulnerable groups themselves have a number of coping mechanisms and capacities to meet at least some of their own needs. Doing relief developmentally and having a proactive response are main themes promoted in REDSO/ESA, and our humanitarian assistance programs in southern Sudan are a good representation of this theme. The preparation of the Sudan ISP in FY 97 and the programs now being implemented under the ISP demonstrates that rehabilitation and recovery (transitional) type programs are more appropriate than pure relief programs in many locations in southern Sudan.

It is important to point out that while these programs are successful, a main constraint facing the southern Sudan program is the lack of USG development funds due to various legislative prohibitions. Over the last few years, BHR/OFDA has recognized the importance of supporting transitional activities within the limitations of their mandate as a means to reducing the overall need for humanitarian assistance and encouraging vulnerable groups to be more self-reliant.

The SSO #4 team changed Indicator 4.2.2: from - The percent of USAID Non-food Resources going to Recovery and Rehabilitation Activities in Southern Sudan" to "Increased USAID Support for Transitional Activities in southern Sudan reflecting the objective of the IR. In FY 96, an estimated $4.5 m was provided for transitional activities

> **Food For Peace Team**
>
> With minimum staff, the team provided key support to BHR/FFP and OFDA in managing the $25.0 M politically complex and geographically difficult humanitarian assistance program in southern Sudan. Our field presence effectively encouraged integration of various USG resources for GHA transitional countries, particularly Sudan. Finally,TDYs to Mozambique helped result in a $16 Title III monetization program.

such as barter shops, agricultural rehabilitation, income generating, veterinary programs, etc. In FY 97, the figure was $5.37 m compared to a target of $5.0 m. We were pleased to have exceeded our target and hope that the target of $5.5 m in FY 98 will be met or excceeded.

Managing for Results/Lessons Learned

Over the last three years, REDSO/ESA has recognized the need to address the underlying causes of food insecurity through preparedness and prevention measures such as providing farmer incentives for increased production, timely provision of seeds/tools and better use of early warning information. REDSO/ESA has also recognized the importance of moving as fast as possible along the relief to development continuum by supporting rehabilitation and recovery (transitional) activities.

Through interaction with our partners and customers over the last few years, through performing TDY services and especially during the design of the Sudan ISP, it became clear that USAID needed to do business differently. REDSO/ESA has identified a number of lessons learned which we plan to take into account in order to achieve our objective. Some of these are:

--"Seamless programming" is critical for transitional country programs. Development assistance must pick up smoothly where relief and rehabilitation assistance ends;

--Building local capacity to ensure a smooth transition is important;

--Capacity-building has been insufficiently linked to practical improvements on the ground;

--Training efforts need to be aimed more at grass roots capacity building and on-the-job applications;

--Vulnerable groups have various coping mechanisms which need to be better understood in order to support not inhibit them;

--Even in complex emergencies it is possible to meet a greater share of the food needs of vulnerable groups through the utilization of local/regional surpluses rather than food from USA;

--Monetization programs to support local/regional purchases to meet emergency food needs must be explored more vigorously; and,

--The number of vulnerable groups in complex emergencies frequently increases on short notice and relief interventions should have contingency reserves, where appropriate, to meet unanticipated needs.

In commenting on the GHAI Transitions Team report, **Linking Relief and Development Programs",** the Administrator stressed that "we must continue to demonstrate to ourselves and to others that we can do business differently and better. Better integration of our relief and development resources is key to improving the way we do business." We are encouraged by the Administrator's message and are challenged to seek out opportunities to demonstrate that we can do business differently and do relief developmentally.

Expected Progress through FY 00

With the approval of the GHAI strategy and budget in September 1997, the SSO #4 team began functioning more along the lines of a full SO team with both the human and financial resources to achieve results.   In FY 98, SSO #4 has been revised into a new results framework (SO #6) with the following characteristics: results driven; aligned to Agency goals and reflecting Agency core values; relates directly to the GHAI strategic framework and allows for the application of GHAI principles; and, allows for convergence and improves synergies between REDSO/ESA, bilateral and central resources to more effectively support the GHAI SOs and goals.   In order to ensure greater cross-fertilization and synergies among the various Strategic Objective teams in REDSO/ESA, the new makeup of the SO #6 team has changed to include a wider multi-disciplinary membership.

It should be noted that the wording of the SO and IRs for SSO #4 and the proposed SO #6 are quite similar and the SO #6 team intends to continue to support the main themes which SSO #4 was promoting: do business differently; reduce vulnerabilities; enhance food security; reduce dependencies; enhance greater self-reliance of vulnerable groups; be more proactive and less reactive; strengthen local capacities; and improve targeting methodologies.

Revised Strategic Framework

SO #6: **Effective Humanitarian and Transitional Assistance Through Strengthened African Capacity**

IR 6.1: Strengthened African Capacities to Respond to crises

IR 6.2: Reduced Reliance on External Humanitarian Assistance Through Enhanced Target Population Capacity

IR 6.3 Strengthened Capacities to Support Good Governance and Democratic Practices in Opposition Controlled Areas of Sudan

Performance Data Tables SO #4

Strategic Support Objective 4: More Effective USAID Responses to Crisis and Transitions Towards Greater Self-reliance
APPROVED: 5/97   **COUNTRY/ORGANIZATION: REDSO/ESA**

RESULT NAME: SSO #4 IR 4.1: More Effective USAID Responses to Crisis and Transitions Towards Greater Self-reliance

INDICATOR: Percent of major humanitarian assistance interventions operating with an approved USAID strategy to address humanitarian crises.   (new indicator)

UNIT OF MEASURE: Approved country development strategies	YEAR	PLANNED	ACTUAL
SOURCE: USAID documents	1996	(B)	60%
INDICATOR DESCRIPTION: Countries having approved strategies which address major humanitarian crisis so that there is a better integration of relief and development resources	1997	80%	80%
COMMENTS: At present, USAID supports major humanitarian interventions in Sudan, Somalia, Rwanda, Burundi and Angola in the ESA region. A major humanitarian assistance program is defined for this indicator as one in which USAID programs more than $10 million in disaster relief (including emergency food aid) in a FY. Naturally, the number of countries which have major humanitarian assistance programs will vary from year to year. An Angola strategy was completed in FY 97. At present, Burundi is the only country of these five which does not have an approved strategy.	1998	100%	
	1999	100%	
	2000	100%	

Strategic Support Objective #4:   More Effective USAID Responses to Crisis and Transitions towards Greater Self-Reliance
APPROVED: 5/97   **C OUNTRY/ORGANIZATION**: REDSO/ESA

RESULT NAME: SSO #4 I.R. 4.2:   Improved Systems for planning and analysis of crisis in place in the ESA Region

INDICATOR: Number of USAID Internal Constraints to Do Business Differently in Humanitarian Crises Removed

UNIT OF MEASURE: internal USAID constraints	YEAR	PLANNED	ACTUAL
SOURCE: USAID documents, grant documents	1996	(B)	0
INDICATOR DESCRIPTION: By internal constraints we are referring to internal guidelines, policies, procedures, restrictions, etc.	1997	2	3*
COMMENTS: The GHAI Transitions Team report "Linking Relief and	1998	2 (new)	
Development Programs" under the Greater Horn of Africa Initiative identified a number of internal constraints and our Administrator has	1999	2 (new)	
stressed that "we must continue to demonstrate to ourselves and to others that we can do business differently and better. Better	2000		
integration of our relief and development resources is key to improving the way we do business." The SSO #4 team members			
have also identified a number of internal constraints which if removed could make our humanitarian assistance programs for			
effective and supportive of the GHAI strategy and principles. * See R4 text for identification of constraints removed.			

Strategic Support Objective 4: More Effective USAID Responses to Crisis and Transitions Towards Greater Self-reliance
APPROVED: 5/97 **COUNTRY/ORGANIZATION:** REDSO/ESA

RESULT NAME: SSO #4 IR 4.3: Enhanced Target Population Capacity to Re-establish Their Livelihoods Following a Crisis

INDICATOR: Increased USAID support for transitional activities in southern Sudan.

UNIT OF MEASURE: ($000,000)	YEAR	PLANNED	ACTUAL
SOURCE: Review/analysis of grant documents	1996	(B)	$4.5
INDICATOR DESCRIPTION: The amount of funds allocated to support transitional (rehabilitation/recovery) activities in southern Sudan	1997	$5.0	$5.37
	1998	$5.5	
COMMENTS: The SSO #4 team has an ongoing dialogue with BHR/OFDA in order to recognize the importance of supporting transitional activities within the limitations of their mandate as a means to reduce the overall need for humanitarian assistance and encouraging vulnerable groups to be more self-reliant. By transitional activities we are referring to those activities which would not be characterized as relief, i.e. barter shop programs, agricultural rehabilitation, provision of seeds/tools, income generating activities, veterinary programs, etc. Southern Sudan is a good example, as have been no development funds available for the past eight years.	1999	$6.0	
	2000	$7.0	

PART III: STATUS OF THE MANAGEMENT CONTRACT

This year's REDSO/ESA R4 is an exception from the Part III guidance. We are neither a close-out, nor termination country/program, nor are we making major strategic changes. Instead, based on its expanded regional platform mandate and full field delegation for the Greater Horn of African Initiative (GHAI), REDSO/ESA is restructuring itself to integrate two fully-vetted and approved Agency strategies, that is, REDSO/ESA's 1995 Country Strategic Plan (CSP) and the November 1997 GHAI Strategic Plan, into a more coherent and unified regional strategic framework. At the same time, we are better aligning objectives and resources by moving to a team-based structure which affords better operational efficiency and gains faster results while maintaining quality technical services levels. The technical services exceptions are project development officer (PDO) and engineering services. For the former, our USDH ceiling is insufficient and, for the latter, present customer demand is too low for a full-time U.S. PSC engineer.

The REDSO/ESA-GHAI integration process has also permitted us to refine our strategic framework and align it with the Agency's revised program goals with one exception. We have not broken out human capacity building as a separate objective, but rather have built it into each of our seven strategic objectives. This SO alignment also permits maximum flexibility to undertake new tasks or responsibilities. This was borne out over the past six months when REDSO/ESA was tasked with taking on the USAID/Somalia program and providing all technical services for the new Democratic Republic of the Congo (DROC); this also permitted us to take advantage of openings in the telecommunications policy harmonization arena with IGAD and the Government of Kenya.

The 1997 REDSO/ESA R4 guidance cable (98 STATE 20253) approved the concept of a broader set of strategic objectives for REDSO/ESA. Thus, there are now seven strategic objectives, as opposed to last year's artificially constrained two SOs and two SSOs which made reporting and review more difficult. By linking directly with Agency strategic goals, REDSO/ESA's revised framework will support more effective results reporting in the future, clearly and more easily link with similar objectives of bilateral ESA missions, and be more efficient from a management standpoint.

The transition to the new set of strategic objectives was done as follows. First, despite an expanded program-implementation and analytical focus, the expanded REDSO/ESA management team agreed last fall that technical services would remain a regional office priority. This decision was confirmed by our annual client-mission survey and most recently reaffirmed by REDSO/ESA customers at the Uganda Agriculture-Environment-Private Sector Officers conference in February 1998. Accordingly, the former Special Support Objective # 1, Effective Technical and Program Support to ESA Missions, has been devolved and decentralized into REDSO/ESA's refined regional strategic framework. This has allowed REDSO/ESA to combine its technical services and program functions under the new team-based structure.

Under the new REDSO/ESA structure, client services can come from anywhere in the organization, be it from an SO team, a cross-sectoral team (e.g., food security), a support team (e.g., Global Information Infrastructure), unit (e.g., Horn of Africa Support Project) to meet a customer need.

Technical expertise from REDSO/ESA's regional program SOs will link directly to and support the achievement of similar SOs of our client Missions. Moreover, results and lessons learned from REDSO/ESA's regional programs can be diffused through technical services to bilateral missions, therefore providing additional synergy and expanded value-added.

REDSO/ESA's former SO#2: Increased Utilization of Critical Information by USAID and Other Decision-makers in the Region, was an artificial aggregation of what properly should have been three SOs. Accordingly, we have sub-divided the former SO#2 into its sectoral components which align with three of the Agency goals of economic growth and agriculture, environment, and population/health. These sub-sector SOs had already been separately reviewed by technical panels in USAID/W during last year's R4 evaluation process so the impact on the review process is minimal, with the exception of the new D/G-Conflict SO.

Changing the former sub-objectives to full strategic objective status provides a clearer sectoral focus, supports a more transparent allocation of budgetary and staff resources, and better places responsibility and accountability for achieving results. At the same time, expanded cross-SO membership maintains synergy between SOs. In addition, we have made one refinement with regard to the first Agency Goal of "Broad-based Economic Growth and Agricultural Development Encouraged" which we have divided into its respective economic growth and agriculture components. Thus, the previous SO#2 has been transformed into the following new configuration:

SO#1: A More Open and Market-Driven Regional Economy;

SO #3: Increased Use of Market-Oriented Agricultural Technologies and Policies in the ESA Region;

SO #4: Improved Child and Reproductive Health Systems in East and Southern Africa; and

SO #5, Improved Regional Collaboration in the Management of Transnational Natural Resources.

In keeping with the "program convergence" concept articulated in the 1997 GHAI Strategy, former SO #3: Establish a Strong Basis for Implementation of the GHAI, has been fully integrated into REDSO/ESA's refined strategic framework. Instead of GHAI being retained as a single, separate SO, all six current REDSO/ESA SOs and the SSO will take on GHAI ownership and use GHAI concepts and principles (e.g., African ownership, regional focus, strategic coordination, promoting stability, and linking relief and development) to implement activities and achieve both REDSO/ESA and GHAI results.

The former SSO #4: More Effective Responses to Humanitarian Crises and Transitions Towards Greater Self-Reliance in the ESA Region: has become SO #6: More Effective Responses to Humanitarian Crises and Timely Transition Towards Greater Self Reliance. Last year this was a strategic support objective since primary operating authority and funding for humanitarian activities remained with BHR/OFDA and BHR/FFP. This year, SO #6 is a full strategic objective to reflect

the REDSO/ESA prospective role in managing the USAID/Somalia program, starting in July 1998, and for implementing new transition activities in southern Sudan in addition to ongoing regional humanitarian assistance activities.

With Agency approval of the GHAI strategy in the fall of 1997, the SO #6 team was created.   The new SO #6 team is aligned to Agency goals and reflects Agency core values and GHAI principles; is directly linked to the GHAI strategic framework; and finally, allows for convergence and improves synergies between REDSO/ESA, bilateral and central resources to more effectively support Agency, REDSO/ESA and GHAI objectives.

To ensure greater cross-fertilization and synergy among the various SO teams, SO #6 core and extended-team membership has been broadened and made more multi-disciplinary.   SO #6 activities, while expanded, reflect SSO and IR continuity and reflect the former SSO #4 themes of doing business differently; reducing vulnerabilities; enhancing food security; reducing dependencies; enhancing greater self-reliance of vulnerable groups; being more proactive and less reactive; strengthening local capacities; and, improving targeting methodologies.

In addition to humanitarian crisis and transition activities, REDSO/ESA has added a strategic objective to address regional conflict management and democracy/governance issues.   This new SO evolved directly from the integration of the GHAI strategic framework and focuses on: Strengthened Regional African Capacity to Manage Conflict and Promote Good Governance.   REDSO/ESA's experience in designing and implementing D/G and conflict strategies and activities for client missions in the ESA region provides a strong base for launching a complementary regional program in D/G and conflict management.   These new regional activities contribute directly to the Agency Goal of building democracy while supporting other Agency goals such as economic growth and countries in transition.

As the field coordination and regional implementation unit for the Greater Horn of Africa Initiative, REDSO/ESA is charged with achieving SO#2 of the GHAI: Strengthened African Capacity to Prevent, Mitigate and Respond to Conflict.   There are important synergies and complementarities between the D/G-Conflict objective and the five other REDSO/ESA strategic objectives and the strategic support objective.   For example, the nexus between access to water resources and conflict mitigation will be one of Africa's most serious issues for the next century.   At the same time, a separate regional D/G-Conflict will focus resources on activities leading to increased African capacity to deal with fundamental conflict and governance issues.

Finally, there are a set of regional activities which either directly support all six strategic objectives (e.g., the Horn of Africa Support Project; performance monitoring and evaluation), or are of a cross-sectoral or cross-cutting nature (e.g., regional analysis, gender, information), such that there is no appropriate individual SO box in which to place them. For this reason, we have created a new Strategic Support Objective: "Regional Support." This SSO will provide REDSO/ESA with both internal SO and cross-sectoral SO support as well as provide the flexibility to take on new tasks and

initiatives. This SSO will be fully fleshed out in next year's R4. At present, notional results are as follows:

In summary, REDSO/ESA is undertaking a strategic resource alignment and allocation process. This exercise has led to an integrated and refined strategic framework and an organizational restructuring to an empowered, team-based platform.   Taken together, REDSO/ESA will be able to better implement regional and GHAI priorities while maintaining quality services for client missions. Next year's R4 will be fully reported in the new seven strategic objective format.

SSO# 7:   **Regional Support**

IR 7.1: GHAI Field Secretariat Operations

IR 7.2: Information and Communication

IR 7.3: Performance Monitorinig and Evaluation

IR 7.4: Gender in Development

IR 7.5: Regional Analytical Agenda

IR 7.6: Regional Program Support

REDSO/ESA

FY 2000 RESOURCES REQUEST

April 1998

Part IV: REDSO/ESA Resource Request

Financial Plan

The Regional Economic Development Services Office for East and Southern Africa (REDSO/ESA) is restructuring itself to integrate two fully-vetted and approved Agency strategies, that is, REDSO/ESA's 1995 CSP and the November 1997 GHAI Strategic Plan, into a more coherent and unified regional strategic framework.   Now the REDSO/ESA program is one with a vision of African-led and African-owned regional approaches to development opportunities, and one which delivers "value-added" complementarity to ESA bilateral Missions. REDSO/ESA requests that its mandate to provide practical responses to the Agency's vision to achieve results for President Clinton's African Trade and Investment Initiative; the Greater Horn of Africa Initiative (GHAI); and, for the six Agency's goals be firmly endorsed.

REDSO/ESA's program funds request for FY 99 matches the AFR/DP program control figures for both the REDSO/ESA "core" OYB at $7.124 M and the GHAI at $15.0 M. This is despite the FY 98 "core" OYB level being below our last year's R4 request by over $2.5 M and the unexpected FY 98 $3.0 M POTUS "tax" against the $15.0 M GHAI control level which went to USAID/Uganda activities. The FY 99 GHAI request assumes that BHR/OTI will provide $3.0 M for the southern Sudan program.

REDSO/ESA's program funds request for FY 00 is somewhat higher than FY 99. We are requesting $8.5 M for the REDSO/ESA "core" OYB and $20.0 M for GHAI. The $8.5 M REDSO/ESA "core" request is still lower than what was requested in last year's R4 for FY 98 and FY 99. The higher GHAI request reflects our need to make up for the POTUS "tax" by budgeting $6.0 M incremental funding for the HASP, which is not taking any funds in FY 98 and only $1.0 M in FY 99.

The detailed budget request for FYs 98, 99 and 00 can be found in the table annex. The FY 98 request is by our current two SOs and two SSOs. For the FY 99 and 00 budget request tables we use our proposed restructured SO framework with six SOs and one SSO.

SO#1 A More Open and Market-Driven Regional Economy

Within the context of one of USAID's Agency Goals for broad-based economic growth and agriculture development encouraged, REDSO/ESA has formed an economic growth (EG)/private sector (PS) strategic objective (SO) team to pursue positive economic and political change in the ESA region.   Particularly, the EG/PS SO team is mandated to achieve its strategic objective: A More Open and Market-driven Economy in the REDSO/ESA Region. Specifically, the EG Team, with and through its partners will accelerate public policy reform and procedures that encourage regional trade, investment and food security; generate an enabling environment for private sector-led growth; and, build capacity of partner organizations that support regional integration.   In order to achieve these results, the EG/PS SO team needs to support the following activities:

East and Southern Africa Business Organization (ESABO)'s "Regional Information Network" effort seeks to "kick start" activities of this young organization to promote regional economic cooperation aimed at achieving "business without boundaries." ESABO's specific areas to build membership are: developing a web site and a regional business newsletter; providing trade information services, as well as trade and investment match-making services; and, hosting critical food and commodity information from IGAD countries to COMESA and SADC countries that can be used to encourage trade from food surplus countries to food deficit areas as part of the Greater Horn of Africa Initiative (GHAI).   ESABO has been named the "private sector voice" of the region by COMESA, through the formation of a Business Consultative Committee.   ESABO seeks to further enhance this role to encourage and develop the private sector dialogue with policymakers of the region. These activities, if funded, have far reaching potential to encourage trade and investment as well as promote private sector and public dialogue that will identify and encourage economic reform. Funds are being requested for FYs 98, 99 and 00.

AABA's "Africa - America Business Partnership" activity concentrates on strengthening its capacity to deliver services, improve its trade networks and expand trade missions to its membership.   AABA will build a partnership with the Corporate Council on Africa (both organizations represent African and American corporations and businesses that encourage increased African and U.S. business and investment) to create trade missions by exchanging technical assistance and logistical services which will result in increased business partnerships and linkages formed between the U.S. and Africa.   AABA plans to build on the success and "lessons learned" from the CCA.   The goal is to establish AABA as an effective, independent, self-sufficient and service-oriented business organization that will increase business partnerships and linkages formed between the U.S. and Africa.   AABA will tap into CCA's management capacities, develop networking systems through the AABAnet website and utilize the Global Technology Network (GTN) to provide match-making investment opportunities and model program activities around CCA's to increase membership that generate revenue.   The results will be the establishment of cost-recovery activities, increased investment for AABA membership and a stronger, viable organization that addresses and supports the needs of African businesswomen. Funds are being requested through FY 00.

The "Regional Investors Roadmap" activity is a direct result of the presentation by The Services Group (TSG) of the Investor's Roadmap to the Council of Ministers meeting in Lusaka, Zambia in November 1997.   COMESA member states are keen to utilize this technology not only on a national basis, but to develop the Roadmap on a "regional" basis to identify specific areas of integration and harmonization of policies and procedures related to investment. COMESA's northern partner, IGAD, has recommended that the Roadmap be conducted in several Horn countries, namely, Eritrea, Ethiopia and Djibouti.   This will assist the role of the private sector to enhance food security. It assures the northern tier is represented in the "regional" map process and has direct linkages to the GHAI.   The bottom line of the Roadmap is to cut the red tape of legal and regulatory constraints, thus improving the investment climate. Funds will be needed in FYs 98 and 99.

COMESA's "WTO Training - Policy Harmonization" activity is to help alert key government and private sector parties in the region to the challenges, and opportunities of the disciplines

of the WTO agreements. This approach is even more important given the recent impasse of the Multilateral Agreement on Investments and the probability of those negotiating being transferred to the WTO.   COMESA's objective to understand and disseminate the "disciplines" of world trade will result in a "baseline" to further advance COMESA's aggressive trade agenda that are in line with WTO rules, guide COMESA member countries into future negotiations and empower COMESA to be pro-active in the region's ability to respond to the challenges and opportunities of the WTO. Funds are being requested through FY 00.

COMESA has requested that REDSO/ESA provide guidance and support to develop institutional strengthening of their information and financial systems which include: computers, software training, travel procedures, property management, personnel policies and accounting procedures.   REDSO/ESA is currently working with ESABO and has just completed a preliminary audit of COMESA. Based on recommendations from the team, REDSO/ESA's long-term commitment is to assist our regional partners become "grant worthy", develop programs and managerial expertise to ensure these organizations are sustainable. Funds are needed in FY 98.

Microenterprise activities have been successful in key GHA countries e.g. Kenya, Uganda and Tanzania. Countries which are in transition e.g. Rwanda, Eritrea and southern Sudan are looking at microenterprise development as being crucial to their income generating and food security strategies. In FY 98 this activity will develop a lessons learned assessment and organize a workshop to discuss some of these findings for successful microenterprise development.

Because REDSO/ESA's responsibilities for management of EG/PS activities will increase significantly beginning in FY 98, SO #1 is seeking the following additional human resources.

Long-term:

--Senior Regional Private Sector Officer - to assist in the management, strategic planning, analysis, and program implementation of the EG/PS SO team and increase the Mission's regional focus with strategic partners, senior government officials, business leaders, and coordinate with bilateral programs on work with such partners and activities.

--PSSA - to assist in the management, strategic planning, analysis, and program implementation of the EG/PS SO team, with a special focus on GHAI.

--FSN Private Sector Officer - to design and manage EG/PS funded activities.

--FSN Women in Development - to manage gender programs and analysis.

Short-term:

--PDO - to support and assist REDSO/ESA's EG/PS strategic objective (SO) team design

and obligate Result Packages and other related documentation to facilitate the obligation of FY 98 funding.

--Marketing Specialist - to provide technical assistance to the EG/PS SO team during the design of Results Packages for FY 98 obligation.

The total funding request for the EG Team to make steady progress toward achieving its Strategic Objective are: REDSO/ESA "core" -- FY 99 $500,000; FY 00 $465,000
                        GHAI funds --FY 99 $2.05 M; FY 00 $765,000

SO #2: Strengthened Regional African Capacity to Manage Conflict and Promote Good Governance

President Clinton's March 1998, visit to Africa opened a new chapter in Africa-U.S relations, and a new commitment to the resolution of conflict in the Great Lakes region.   Participants in the Entebbe Summit of African leaders in the Great Lakes region enthusiastically renewed their dedication to working together and to a new partnership between Africa and the U.S. to resolve conflict.   Participants emphasized that peace, security and stability are necessary prerequisites for social and economic development.   To this end, it was agreed, the peaceful resolution of conflicts must be the guiding principle in the conduct of countries and peoples of Africa.   It was agreed that the people of Africa have a right to democratic governance, respect for human rights and the banishing of the ideology of genocide, and that the spirit of tolerance, reconciliation and power sharing should be cultivated so that political instability can be prevented.   At the core of this commitment to conflict resolution and support for democratic governance is the recognition that the destiny and security of Africa lie primarily in the hands of Africans.

In direct support of African efforts in the Greater Horn, REDSO/ESA will launch its initial regional DG/Conflict activities in FY 98.   The first activities under this new strategic objective will be those envisioned in the GHAI strategy: a "Quick Response Conflict-Management Fund," and several conflict-related pilot activities and studies coordinated by USAID missions in the Greater Horn.

The Quick Response Conflict-Management Fund, planned at approximately $1.0 M per year for FYs 98, 99 and 00, will be available to a wide range of entities, including bilateral missions.   It will be utilized to fund African participation in one-time or limited activities, such as summits or peace conferences, which seek to prevent, mediate or resolve conflicts. Over time, the fund might be expanded to provide other types of conflict related support.

FY 98 and 99 funding, at approximately $1.0 M each year, will also support USAID Mission-coordinated activities including: continued efforts in the Karamoja peace process in Uganda to devise ways to prevent inter-ethnic clashes; support for locally-based non-governmental organizations involved in CPMR on a regional level in Tanzania; support for peace dialogue among groups within and across the northern Kenya borders, including Ethiopia and Sudan; and, possible support to non-governmental organizations for conflict resolution activities, including training, in Somalia.

These initial activities will enable USAID to utilize critical lessons learned in its DG/Conflict efforts throughout the region.   They will contribute most directly to REDSO/ESA's Intermediate Result (IR) 2.3: Pilot Activities Developed and Tested to Establish Best Practices, and will also contribute significantly to IR 2.1: Indigenous Organizations Strengthened, and IR 2.2: Effective Regional Mechanisms for Responding to Conflict Developed. In addition, through the Quick Response Fund, USAID will learn about the players in the region, and identify common constraints and objectives in the area of CPMR, which will lead to future progress in achieving IR 2.4: Networking, partnership building and strategic coordination enhanced, and IR 2.5: Regional mechanisms that help governments or citizens achieve better governance developed.

REDSO/ESA, in collaboration with its partners in the region and in the USG, plans to use the knowledge and experience gained in these initial activities to design more comprehensive results packages to include activities which will achieve all five of its intermediate results. The initial obligation for these results packages will be in FY 99.

FY 98, 99 and 00 funding will also enable REDSO/ESA to hire the appropriate DG/Conflict team members to further design and manage SO#2 results packages, and productively liaise with partners in the region and in the USG to achieve the strategic objective.   DG/Conflict team members will also provide services to USAID missions in the ESA region upon request.

The total funding request for the DG Team for its planned activities is:
                              REDSO/ESA "core" -- FY 99 $520,000; FY 00 $540,000
                              GHAI funds --FY 99 $3.482 M; FY 00 $3.245 M

SO#3: "Increased Use of Market-Oriented Agricultural Technologies and Policies in the ESA Region"

The level of resources required for effective implementation of REDSO/ESA's new agriculture and food security strategy is largely addressed in the Mission's current program budget plans.   Therefore, the new SO#3 strategy will not radically change the current level of funding.

The Agency, in recognition of the critical importance of agriculture to the success of its development assistance programs, recently revised its economic growth goal in the new agency strategic framework to explicitly address agriculture. REDSO/ESA likewise, is adjusting its strategic framework to specifically incorporate a results framework for agriculture and food security. Within this context, REDSO/ESA in collaboration with the Global Bureau and the AFR/SD and in support of the Greater Horn of Africa Initiative, have jointly succeeded in creating a regional capacity for planning and implementing African-owned and impact-oriented agricultural research programs within the region. The Association for Strengthening Agricultural Research in East and Central Africa (ASARECA) has been the key organizational mechanism in this effort. ASARECA is a regional agricultural research coordinating association comprised of ten countries. Through its approved and adopted operational strategy, the ASARECA programs:

a) contribute to food security in the region;
b) contribute to the transformation process of African agriculture from subsistence to market-orientattion;
c) contribute to African institutional and human capacity strengthening, thereby promoting the growth of both external and internal regional agricultural development partnerships;

In this resource request, REDSO/ESA recognizes the benefits of continued collaboration with both the Global Bureau and the AFR/SD in this joint effort to support ASARECA programs within the region. Key programs under this request shall include:

a) Agricultural Research Networks: Agricultural research networking is a concept that has evolved within the region and adopted in the ASARECA strategy as an efficient technology development and transfer mechanism. In practice, small and largely underfunded national commodity focussed agricultural research programs are enabled to develop and share specific commodity technology within the region. In this respect, research programs get access to technologies which they would otherwise have limited access. As indicated in the performance section of this report, some technologies are having a direct positive impact on the food security of the people of the region due to increased food production and accompanying free market efforts interventions.

Funds are being requested for FY99 and FY 00 to support three ASARECA agricultural research networks to support the activities of the Eastern Africa root crops research network (EARNET) backstopped by the International Institute for Tropical Agriculture (IITA), The Eastern and Central Africa Bean Research Network (ECABREN) backstopped by the International Center for Tropical Agriculture (CIAT) and The Potato and Sweet Potato Research Network backstopped by the International Potato Center (CIP). The resources will be utilized to promote partnerships between the research programs, the International agricultural research centers (IARC's), the private sector, the NGO's and PVO's and the farmers organizations and farming communities.

b) ASARECA CORE Support: ASARECA, as a research coordinating association operates within a strategic framework that has been prepared and approved by the stakeholders. REDSO/ESA participated in this process through the use of GHAI resources. The inter-governmental Authority on Development (IGAD) as an advocacy organ, has initiated dialogue with ASARECA. In addition to USAID, other donor communities including the European Union are increasingly getting interested in ASARECA programs. A working partnership has been established between ASARECA and REDSO/ESA that will contribute to a possible leveraging of resources from the other donor communities. Being a growing institution, we propose to introduce core support to ASARECA as an institution to increase its capacity to engage in informed dialogue as well as improve on its capacity to coordinate regional networking research programs.

c) The Technology Transfer Project: REDSO/ESA in collaboration with AFR/SD and the Greater Horn of Africa Initiative have worked out strategic planning models jointly with ASARECA. The Technology Transfer Project of ASARECA promotes such models. A successful pilot activity was initiated during FY 96 and due to high demand for such a

program a follow-on activity has been funded through GHAI resources. However, due to anticipated increased market orientation of African agriculture, we believe that demand for these resources shall increase. This is an ASARECA activity but implemented by the International Potato Center (CIP).

d) ASARECA Policy Analysis Initiative: In 1997, under the auspices of the ASARECA, and with support from AFR/SD, GHAI and REDSO/ESA, a regional program for Agricultural Policy Analysis in East and Central Africa was initiated. The purpose of this network is to develop regional institutional capacity to identify, analyze and eliminate policy constraints to the development of Agriculture in the region. A wide range of partnerships will result from this activity with a focus on key constraint policies and regulations.

e) ASARECA has identified seed material production and availability as a major constraint to the cropping system in the region. To understand this further, the ASARECA has requested for support for a regional seed trade initiative.

f. There is increasing interaction and cooperation between REDSO/ESA and IGAD. This cooperation has contributed to the initiation of dialogue between these two institutions on activities related to the Livestock sector within the region. It is anticipated that this dialogue shall continue.

Program Funded Personnel Requirements

Implementation of the SO#3 strategy is feasible within current staffing levels. However, implementation would be significantly enhanced if a position were added via transfer of one U.S. Direct Hire (USDH) position from G Bureau to REDSO/ESA. This position would be to provide improved management of USAID-funded livestock activities being carried out under the ASARECA livestock network (AANET).

The program funded staff:

- ▸ Agricultural Advisor: USPSC
- ▸ Agricultural Advisor: FSN PSC
- ▸ Policy Analyst: USPSC
- ▸ Policy Analyst: USDA/RSSA; 20% of time
- ▸ Administrative Assistant: FSN PSC

The total funding request for the AG/FS Team to make steady progress toward achieving its Strategic Objective are: REDSO/ESA "core" -- FY 99 $1.32 M; FY 00 $2.0 M
GHAI funds --FY 99 $2.0 M; FY 00 $1.5 M

SO#4: Improved Child and Reproductive Health Systems in East and Southern Africa:

One major set of activities is now underway, as all PHN activities are being moved within SO#4. The mechanism for implementing and achieving SO#4 has come to be known as "Health Networks." In January 1998, there was an evaluation of the SO#4 Health Networks.

The Network evaluation not only assessed results in individual technical areas but also examined the effectiveness of the overall Network strategy. It determined that "...as it has been implemented over the last four years...[it] has proven to be a successful and innovative approach to promoting and facilitating important health reforms throughout the region," and **"emphasizes REDSO/ESA's complementary and facilitative role in its relationship with partners such as the bilateral missions, CAs, governments, NGOs and other donors in the region."**

The resource need is to fully fund the Health Networks results package, currently being planned, with full implementation in FY 99. In FY 98 the total funding required in the PHN office, for staffing, support of Global Bureau CAs (as partners), beginning the new RP for SO#4, and local agreements, both from the REDSO/ESA OYB and from GHAI funding is $5,495,000. In FY 99 the amount required is $4,522,000. In FY 00 on through FY 02, the amount required remains straight lined at $5.0 M.

During FY 98, as a part of SO#4, a major initiative has gotten underway to establish a food security and nutrition monitoring system, working with indigenous organizations in the GHAI focus countries. Global Bureau child survival and nutrition programs and USAID mission representatives met in Kenya to initiate planning activities and expanded the planning exercise to include African partners in a meeting in Eritrea. Implementation of this program is now underway and a distinction is made in the resource request to identify GHAI funding.

In order to present the requested amounts in a manner that permits a distinction of GHAI funding, the request is broken into two portions, REDSO/ESA core OYB and GHAI funds, although REDSO/ESA is responsible for both. The split between the REDSO/ESA OYB core budget and GHAI funding is as follows: FY 99 -- REDSO/ESA core OYB $3,522,000 and GHAI funds $1.0 M; for FY 00 the split is $3.55 M from REDSO/ESA core OYB and $1.5 M from GHAI funds.

SO#5: Regional Promotion of Improved E/NRM

Wildlife-Livestock Disease Mapping in the GHA

Disease resident in wildlife and livestock populations manifest themselves unpredictably in different parts of the GHA. Witness, for example, the rinderpest epidemic that decimated wildlife in Tsavo National Park in 1996, and the recent outbreak of Rift Valley Fever along the Somalia-Kenya border that resulted in significant human mortality.

Currently disease outbreak prevention is haphazard because of insufficient knowledge of the distribution of disease agents throughout the region. Thus, disease control agencies, such as the OAU/IBAR, are unable to establish a pro-active disease prevention strategy and are confined to a reactive mode. Furthermore, insufficient knowledge of the wildlife-livestock disease interface has led to the unwarranted construction of veterinary cordon fences with drastic negative impact on wildlife. The purpose of this activity is to develop the knowledge base to allow regional livestock and wildlife institutions implement a pro-active disease control and prevention program. This is essential if regional livestock trade is to be

promoted.   The activity will be undertaken by the OAU/IBAR program, and will complement efforts currently undertaken by the European Union.

Serengeti-Mara Ecosystem Joint Spatial-Dynamic Analysis and Joint Planning

The Mara-Serengeti ecosystem is considered one of the seven natural wonders in the world. This ecosystem is under intense pressure due to land conversion, hunting, disease, and uncontrolled tourism development.   Attempts at coordinated management planning between Kenya and Tanzania are feeble.

The short-term purpose of this activity is to develop a geo-referenced (GIS) spatial-dynamic model of the Mara-Serengeti ecosystem to quantify the consequences of current trends and explore alternative scenarios.   The information generated by the model will be used to catalyze an informed dialogue between Tanzanian and Kenyan stakeholders, with the ultimate goal of arriving at a joint management agreement for the Serengeti-Mara ecosystem. This activity will be carried out through a buy-in to the Small Ruminant-Collaborative Research Support Program.

Kenya-Uganda-Ethiopia Rangelands Harmonization Meetings

Range and livestock management in the transboundary pastoral areas of Kenya, Uganda, southern Sudan and Ethiopia is hampered due to insecurity.   Pastoral herds are unable to move from dry to wet season grazing areas due to increasing conflict.   This causes a concentration of livestock in smaller areas increasing over-grazing, cattle mortality, and food insecurity.

The purpose of this activity is to bring pastoral groups and NGO institutions together, in order to foster a process to diminish the intensity of conflicts and allow for the resumption of historical herd movement patterns.   This differs from previous attempts at border harmonization, in that increased stability will be clearly associated with an immediate improvement in animal health delivery systems by OAU/IBAR/PARC.   The OAU/IBAR/PARC program will organize the workshop and, given the mandate, follow-up activities.   This is a joint activity with SO#2 and SO#3.

Regional Integrated Coastal Zone Management Capacity Building

The judicious ecological management of coastal areas is crucial to the economic development of coastal countries in East Africa where 35 million people live.   This is not taking place. Fish catches in the region have declined by over 40% in the last 15 years and it is estimated that about 50% of East African people whose job it is to fish will lose their employment in the next 20 years.

Despite significant progress since the Arusha Resolution signed in 1993, lack of skilled human resources remains a stumbling block to coastal management.   Thus, the purpose of this activity is to elevate African capacity to do ICZM in East Africa.   The activity will: 1) support a short-training course in FY 98; 2) complete a regional needs assessment and

develop a long-term training strategy; and, 3) provide core support for key elements of the strategy.   This effort is complementary to Intercoastal Zone Management (ICZM) activities currently supported by USAID/Tanzania and USAID/Kenya.   It will be coordinated by the Coastal Resources Center of the University of Rhode Island through an existing cooperative agreement with Global Bureau.

Lake Victoria Water Hyacinth Management Strategy

Water hyacinth is one of the biggest ecological problems facing East and Southern Africa. This problem has reached critical proportions in Lake Victoria.

In spite of the input of considerable resources for the implementation of a Lake Victoria Environmental Management Program, little progress has been made towards the control of this aquatic weed.   One important reason for this performance has been the lack of effective collaboration between the four riparian states, Tanzania, Kenya, Rwanda and Uganda.   Thus, the purpose of this activity is to develop a regional water hyacinth control plan to which the four nations subscribe and support.   USAID/Uganda will have the lead in this activity, with REDSO/ESA guiding the process to ensure African ownership, regionalism, and strategic planning.   This will be done through a cooperative agreement between an NGO and USAID/Uganda.

Regional Environment and Natural Resources Results Package

SO#5 is a new SO within REDSO/ESA's strategy.   Accordingly, the SO team is developing its program in a participatory manner and is unable at this juncture to specify some aspects of its program.   Capacity building in EIA, analysis of the linkages between land-use changes in arid and semi-arid areas, conflict and conservation, and support for a regional tourism initiative are potential areas of involvement.   The nature of future activities will be defined in FY 98, after further consultations with stakeholders.

Activity Development/Design

As stated above SO#5 is a developing program area for REDSO/ESA.   The SO team envisions that over the next two years considerable activity development will take place. Given the emphasis on partner and stakeholder involvement, the team will need resources to bring stakeholders together in support of joint program development.

New USPSC/TCN/FSN Environmental and Natural Resources Management Advisor

With the increased programmatic responsibilities associated with the GHAI and other REDSO/ESA's programs, there is a need to increase the technical strength of the E/NRM team.   This is necessary for REDSO/ESA to maintain the level and quality of its service provision to missions.

Secretary

Currently the E/NRM team does not have the services of a full-time secretary. This individual is necessary to meet the growing responsibilities and workload of the E/NRM team.

Regional Natural Resources Management Advisor

The NRM advisor serves as the team leader and provides services to Missions on strategic planning, activity design and evaluation, and collaborates with the Regional Environmental Advisor in EIA training and environmental review compliance. This position is to be continued.

Regional Environmental Advisor

The REA provides essential services to Missions in meeting legal environmental review requirements. The REA is USAID/AFR's single most important environmental impact assessment trainer, and is the individual within REDSO/ESA whose environmental expertise is sought more than any other. This position is to be continued.

The total funding request for the E/NRM Team to begin solid implementation steps toward achieving its Strategic Objective are:

> REDSO/ESA "core" -- FY 99 $720,000; FY 00 $940,000 M
> GHAI funds --FY 99 $2.0 M; FY 00 $2.0 M

S0#6: More Effective Responses to Humanitarian Crises and Timely Transition Towards Greater Self Reliance

SO#6 supports Agency goal 5, "Lives saved, suffering reduced and conditions for political and economic development re-established," and its corresponding objectives. SO#6 also supports the achievement of objectives of BHR/FFP, BHR/OFDA and the GHAI. The achievement of SO#6 can only be accomplished and measured through joint activities and results at REDSO/ESA, bilateral field mission levels as well as at the central (BHR) level.

In FY 98, the SO#6 team is requesting $3.5 million under REDSO/ESA's GHAI budget allotment in support of the achievement of its objective. SO#6: Effective Humanitarian and Transitional Assistance Through Strengthened African Capacity is closely linked with the two GHAI SOs, SO#1: Strengthened Africa Capacity to Enhance Regional Food Security and SO#2: Strengthened Africa Capacity to Prevent, Mitigate and Respond to Conflict in the GHA Region. Our customers and partners have long argued that USAID and other donors bring in too much food aid and that it would be better to maximize the use of local/regional food resources in meeting the nutritional needs of vulnerable groups. IR 1.3 of GHAI's SO#1 calls for "Food Needs of Targeted Populuations Met Through Enhanced Regional Capacities." SO#6 will take the lead within REDSO/ESA to try to achieve this IR and will program an estimated $250,000 in FY 98 and $300,000 in FY 99 to support a number of analytical studies and pilot activity designs which we anticipate will leverage additional BHR funds to support new innovative projects.

The SO#6 team is now designing and implementing a new democracy and governance (DG)

program for opposition-controlled areas of Sudan, following a deputies' decision that this should be a new USAID priority.   In collaboration with SO#2, the Sudan DG program will require $3.0 M in GHAI funds in FY 98 and is scheduled to receive $3.0 M in BHR/OTI funds in FY 99.

The SO#6 team is also taking the lead in supporting activities under GHAI SO#2. IR2.2: Effective Regional Mechanisms for Responding to Conflict Supported. Under this IR, the SO#6 team will work with IGAD to design interventions for pilot refugee reintegration programs which will require $250,000 in FY 98 and FY 99 respectively.   The SO#6 team will also work with Missions in Tanzania, Rwanda and Burundi to design pilot refugee reintegration programs which will require $250,000 in FY 99.

The SO#6 team also plans to design a new IQC mechanism in FY 99 to design and/or support a number of small innovative pilot projects in support of the achievement of our objective.   This IQC will utilize $400,000 in FY 99 with $200,000 coming from the Sudan DG program (OTI funds) and $200,000 from core REDSO/ESA funding.

In summary, the SO#6 team requests $3.8 M in FY 99, with $3.0 M in BHR/OTI funds, $600,000 in GHAI funds and $200,000 in REDSO/ESA core funds. In FY 2000 the request is for$3.3 M in GHAI funds and $200,000 in REDSO/ESA core funds.

SS0#7: Regional Support

This SSO comprises a set of regional activities which either directly support all six strategic objectives (e.g., the Horn of Africa Support Project; performance monitoring and evaluation), or are of a cross-sectoral or cross-cutting nature (e.g., regional analysis, gender, information). Its major components are named here notionally as

> IR 7.1:   GHAI Field Secretariat Operations
>
> IR 7.2:   Information and Communication
>
> IR 7.3:   Performance Monitorinig and Evaluation
>
> IR 7.4:   Gender in Development
>
> IR 7.5:   Regional Analytical Agenda
>
> IR 7.6:   Regional Program Support

This SSO will provide REDSO/ESA with both internal SO and cross-sectoral SO support, as well as provide the flexibility to take on new tasks and initiatives.

GHAI Secretariat Operations

Under REDSO/ESA's restructuring, overall management and oversight of the GHAI will be

the responsibility of a small GHAI "Secretariat" within the Front Office.   Staffed by a USDH GHAI Coordinator, a AAAS Fellow and an FSNPSC Program Assistant, the GHAI Secretariat will assist REDSO/ESA's new Strategic Objective Teams in implementing the GHAI Strategic Plan.   A related function of the Secretariat will be to assist these Teams, as well as bilateral Missions in the GHA region, in understanding and working toward the GHAI overarching goal of USAID "program convergence" in the region.   The Secretariat will also serve as the primary point of contact for GHAI/Washington staff as well as bilateral Mission GHAI Coordinators.

Information and Communication

This effort will support REDSO/ESA SOs develop their electronic information capacities and capabilities for information dissemination in furtherance of accomplishing IRs. Furthermore, it will have responsibility for achieving under the GHAI Strategy IR 3.1: Broader Information Dissemination on GHAI. It will undertake the Greater Horn Information and Outreach Service (GHIOS) to achieve I.R. 3.1 by hiring a Communications Specialist, an Internet Specialist and an Intranet Specialist who will all dedicate their time collecting and disseminating GHAI related information among stakeholders and partners in the region, using Internet technologies and hardcopy publications to reach stakeholders and partners who do not have Internet access.

Performance Monitoring and Evaluation

This area will focus on support to ESA missions in establishing performance monitoring and evaluation systems. Certainly we in USAID, including now the IG, are aware of a critical gap in implementing our reinvented operations. Performance monitoring systems need to be put into place to help guide us in our efforts to manage for results. All operating units need a system to determine as objectively as possible how well our Result Packages are performing with respect to accomplishing our target and making progress to achieving SOs. This element of SSO#7 will primarily focus on supporting ESA Missions to establish these systems.

Gender in Development

An activity would be financed to advance the Platform for Action of the Fourth World Conference on Women, the Platform for Action, and the ideas developed at the Uganda Forum (on women). As follow-up to Beijing, women's NGOs in the eastern Africa region have succeeded in setting up regional plans and institutions, identifying priorities, and developing implementation programs for the Platform for Action. The Sub-regional Support Initiative for the Advancement of Women (SSI) was established at the Uganda Forum in 1996 and includes representation from: Eritrea, Ethiopia, Kenya, Rwanda, Somalia, Tanzania and Uganda (Burundi is also a member but has been unable to participate due to political problems).

A Gender Impact Assessment would increase the ability to assess impact by gender for program management in USAID-supported programs in the ESA region. Little systematic assessment has been made of the advancements made by women over the last twenty years in

which concerted efforts have been made to advance their position. Most development organizations continue to base development assumptions on a situation of women supported mainly by anecdotal information. This activity would carry out a four-country pilot analysis in the ESA region to identify current trends and their underlying structures. These analyses will form the basis for tracking changes affecting women and in developing a rationale for integrating a gender perspective into regional policies.

Regional Analytical Agenda

This effort will help us and our partners to look forward and prepare us for the realities that will be emerging over the next few years. For example, trade agreements will require changes in tariffs which will impact on revenue and industrial location choices. Current HIV/AIDS prevalency rates will result in higher deaths. Also, if peace comes to be realized in Somalia, we should be thinking now how to prepare for it. All these examples are issues that should be analyzed with an eye toward how it will impact development in the region over the next few years so that we and our partners can be prepared for the likely outcomes, whatever they may be.

Regional Program Support

There are several aspects encompassed by this area, however, the most significant are two primary components of the Horn of Africa Support Project: institutional support and strengthening of IGAD; and the Institutional Strengthening and Grantmaking Program for African NGOs. By strengthening IGAD, we will help to build an African regional platform that will greatly facilitate donor coordination in the GHA and promote African-led initiatives. A basic tenet of the ISGM is that in order to help achieve food security and conflict prevention, the capacity of African NGOs working in these areas must be strengthened. In addition to these efforts, regional support includes programmatic support for REDSO/ESA's SOs and to the extent possible, ESA client missions.

The total funding request for SSO#7 is:
REDSO/ESA "core" -- FY 99 $342,000; FY 00 $805,000 M
GHAI funds --FY 99 $3.87 M; FY 00 $7.7 M

Prioritization of Objectives

Because of the integration of GHAI and technical services to ESA Missions into the six new strategic objectives and one strategic support objectives, the prioritization of objectives is not a straight forward exercise. It is important to realize that all of REDSO/ESA's new SOs are well interlinked and critical to achieving the GHAI strategic objectives, REDSO/ESA's goal of Broad-Based Sustainable Development in the ESA Region, and the Agency's overarching goals.

► **Strategic Objective #1: A More Open and Market-Driven Regional Economy**- is REDSO/ESA's highest priority strategic objective. This Objective is in line with and supports the achievement of 1). President Clinton's African Trade and Investment

Initiative 2) the Greater Horn of Africa Initiative's food security strategic objective; and, 3) the Agency's number one goal of Economic Growth. The expected impact will be broad, encompassing increases in regional trade and investment, per capita income growth and expanded access and opportunities for the poor across sectors. REDSO/ESA SO#1 partners, such as Common Market of East and Southern Africa (COMESA), East and Southern Africa Business Association (ESABO) and the Intergovernmental Authority on Development (IGAD), will take the lead in achieving the objective of regional economic cooperation, and ultimately regional economic integration.

Intermediate Results:

-- IR1.1: Build Capacity of Partner Organizations that Support Regional Integration, and IR1.2: Generate an Enabling Environment for Private Sector Led Growth are indispensable to the achievement of the Strategic Objective (SO). Efforts will be made to maintain a sufficient level of funding to satisfactorily support activities for these IRs. Financial shortfalls for this SO would have to be absorbed by IR3, thereby reducing its effectiveness and contribution to the achievement of the SO.

▸ **Strategic Objective #2: Strengthened Regional African Capacity to Manage Conflict and Promote Good Governance** - is equally important and in many respects fundamental to the success of SO #1. It is ranked number two in priority primarily because of the overarching importance of economic growth and food security. The reduction of conflict in the region, and more transparent and accountable government institutions are essential to the sustainable achievement of all of REDSO/ESA's strategic objectives.

Intermediate Results:

-- Reductions in funding to this SO would not impact ongoing activities as much as the design of planned new activities. Results package designs under IR 2.4: Networking, Partnership-Building and Strategic Coordination Enhanced and IR 2.5: Regional Mechanisms That Help Governments or Citizens Achieve Better Governance would be delayed, thereby slowing the pace of progress for these important results.

▸ Ranking third is Strategic Objective (SO) #6: Effective Humanitarian and Transitional Assistance Through Strengthened African Capacity. SO #6 was previously funded only by BHR to provide humanitarian relief. As this SO takes over the Somalia program and continues with the Sudan portfolio, this SO, for the first time, will link relief and development. With the wide range of technical expertise and humanitarian assistance experience resident in REDSO/ESA, and the location of Nairobi-based regional offices for many UNOs, IOs, NGOs, and donors, REDSO/ESA will still have a comparative advantage in collecting and analyzing data and other useful information, and in monitoring and managing USAID humanitarian assistance resources.

Intermediate Results:

-- Providing emergency assistance to distressed and displaced people will continue to be this SO's primary purpose, with the long range view of linking relief and development. Funding cuts would undermine this SOs ability to effectively achieve that result. Two IRs, IR 6.1: Strengthed African Capacities to Respond to Crises and IR 6.2: Reduced Reliance on External (Humanitarian) Assistance Through Enhanced Target Population Capacity.would be impacted negatively if funds were reduced. The SO #6 Team would have great difficulty achieving IR 6.1 if funds were cut. Instead of progress towards self-confidence and strength to resolve crises, we would see an increase self-doubt, weakness and dependency developing in this disaster-prone region. IR 6.2 would also be negatively impacted. IR6.2 and IR6.1 are very interdependent. A decline in resources would reduce the number of innovate transitional activities being implemented. Since our priority is to progress along the relief to development continuum as quickly as possible, both short and long term progress would be in jeopardy.

▸ **Strategic Objective #3 - Increased Utilization of Market Oriented Agricultural Technologies and Policies in the ESA Region** - is another critically important component of GHAI's food security SO. As our fourth ranked SO, agricultural research and market-oriented agricultural technologies lays the foundation for increased food security in the region. Since many countries in the region still rely heavily on the agricultural sector as a source of income and employment, the work of this SO is of major importance.

 Intermediate Results

-- The commodity research networks activity, which fall under IR 2.1: Application of Improved Technologies, would be protected in the event of a funding shortfall. The technology transfer project, which contributes to IR2.2: Strategic Partnerships Formed to Develop, Disseminate and Apply Improved Agricultural Technologies and Polices, and the ECAPAPA/agricultural policy activities, under IR2.3: Identification and Implementation of Effective Market-Oriented Production and Marketing Policies, would have to absorb any cuts in funding to this SO. This would obviously negatively impact achievement for IR2.2 and IR2.3.

▸ Ranked fifth, is **Strategic Objective #4: Improved Child and Reproductive Health Systems in East and Southern Africa**. It comprises the best managed and implemented set of activities within the REDSO/ESA portfolio. The Health Networks, which is the core activity of SO #4, is cited as a classic example of the advantages of value-added synergies between USAID/W, bilateral Missions and REDSO/ESA. It also is the most advanced in REDSO/ESA in building local capacity and has pioneered an extremely effective approach for developing a sense of "regionalism" and African ownership for initiatives in the PHN sector.

Intermediate Results:

-- If a decrease in funding occurred, the IRs would not change, because they are so well integrated with and mutually supportive of each other, and it would not be possible to drop an

IR and still attain the SO.   A reduction in funding would, however, slow down the attainment of IRs and the SO, as activities would have to be spread over a longer period of time.

▶   Strategic Objective (SO) #5: **Regional promotion of improved E/NRM** - answers to the fact that effective regional action is necessary to conserve the region's renewable natural resources and enhance the quality of life.   This is so, amongst other things, because national borders and those of ecological systems do not coincide. REDSO/ESA's knowledge of regional issues and networking capability, places it in a unique position to take advantage of regional natural resource management opportunities.

 Intermediate Results:

-- The SO team is developing its program in a participatory manner, with some elements still being designed. However, capacity building in EIA, the development of joint management agreements for transboundary resources, mitigation of natural resources-centered conflicts, capacity building in coastal zone management, and support for a regional tourism initiative are potential areas of involvement.   Deficient funding would imply a reexamination of involvement in those sub-sectors.

The logic of the results framework developed by the SO #5 implies that progress would have to be achieved in all intermediate results for the achievement of the strategic objective.   This being the case, a reduction in resources would entail a reduction in REDSO/ESA's planned spectrum of activities rather than sacrificing any one IR.   Nonetheless, REDSO/ESA would be forced to focus on areas where progress has been greatest and for which there is adequate capacity.   Thus, IR 5.2: improved African capacity to manage natural resources, would be most affected.

While technical services to ESA Mission is no longer a strategic objective, it is critically important to remember that the services provided by the Regional Financial Management Center (RFMC), Procurement, Legal, DMB and PDPS offices will remain extremely important to the ESA sub-region. Ethiopia, Rwanda, Tanzania, Zambia Eritrea, Burundi, Djibouti, Comoros, Mauritius, and the Seychelles all depend on RFMC to provide Controller and/or accounting/financial reporting services. The provision of these services will continue to be indispensable to East African Missions.   Also, REDSO/ESA assistance will be critical for the non-NMS countries to meet NMS reporting requirements.

Linkage of Field Support

Centrally funded resources from USAID/W such as the Global Bureau and AFR/SD are fully integrated into REDSO/ESA programs.   REDSO/ESA has a number of activities and USPSCs funded under projects such as PARTS, HHRAA, and EAGER, among several others, that are interwoven throughout our program and contribute directly to the achievement of our strategic objectives.   This is particularly true in health and population; and economic growth sectors under SO#2. While REDSO/ESA is increasingly developing its own mechanisms,

without field support, REDSO/ESA would not currently be able to operate its program.   (See Global Field Support Table)

Workforce and Operating Expense

Overview of FY 98 OE Levels

REDSO/ESA's current O.E. level is US$5,118,900 (including the REDSO/ESA share of ICASS costs).   This level will enable REDSO/ESA to successfully achieve REDSO/ESA program targets in FY 98.   The staffing level for REDSO/ESA OE-funded personnel at the end of FY 98 will be 23 USDHs, 56 FSNs, and two USPSCs.   Office operations and procurement costs are shared with USAID/Kenya (USAID/Kenya 40% and REDSO/ESA 60%).

FSN Salaries

The Ambassador's policy is to keep the Mission FSN employees within the range of the 75th to the 99th percentiles in the Nairobi labor market.   This has resulted in an FSN salary budget increase of 22% in FY 98.   FSN salaries and benefits make up 23.6% of the total budget.

USDH and US PSC Costs

REDSO/ESA currently supports 23 USDH.   The entitlement travel movement of USDH in FY 98 included 5 replacements, 5 home leaves, and 10 R&Rs. There was an increase in the education fees at the International School of Kenya.   Residential rent has been budgeted at an average of $18,400 per house for the 23 USDHs.   Any fallout funds received from the Africa Bureau will be used to fund unplanned transfers and USPSC costs associated with RFMC due to a directed mid-tour transfer in December 1997, with no replacement likely to be named by M/FM in the near future.

Operational Travel and Training

Operational travel and training includes both international and local site visits, conferences, retreats and training.   The emphasis this fiscal year is on training as REDSO/ESA reorganizes itself into new Strategic Objective Teams and Mission Support Teams.   The FY 98 budget contains the minimum amount adequate to monitor REDSO/ESA Strategic Objectives, provide support to the client Missions, and to maintain quality levels within the professional staff.

Rent, Security, Utilities and Maintenance

These costs are shared with USAID/Kenya.   Office rent, warehouse rent, and security costs have been straight-lined from FY 97.   There is no significant increase expected. REDSO/ESA is charged with 60% and USAID/Kenya is charged with 40% of the shared costs for office and residential items which cannot be easily identified to the ultimate

beneficiary.   Inflation of 10% has been factored into Utilities and Maintenance.   This is due in part to high generator fuel costs caused by frequent power failures and by the increase of electricity costs from Kenya Power.   Bad weather and the poor road network have caused Motor Vehicle Maintenance to increase this year.

NXP, Supplies, and Freight

Minimum NXP is budgeted for FY 98 at $210,000.   Supplies have been budgeted at the minimum forecasted requirements.   This includes Residential Supplies, Office Supplies, ADP Supplies, and Motor Vehicle Parts.   Freight costs are expected to rise as a result of the poor road infrastructure mentioned above.

It is important to worthy of note that the budget has assumed that ADP equipment is currently Y2K compatible.   No estimate of additional equipment update for this is included in these estimates.   However, later information from IRM infer that USAID/Kenya Complex will require a software suite which, at the 60% share, will push up the current requirement by an extra $150,000.   It is hoped that AID/Washington has central funds that will be available for this purchase.

Overview of FY 99 OE Levels

The target level for FY 99 is 5,118,900 (including REDSO/ESA's share of ICASS costs). This should be adequate to support 21 USDHs, 56 FSNs, and two US PSCs.   REDSO/ESA puts forward a request budget for $5,525,200 expected to an adequate for the increased USDH presence to 24.   REDSO/ESA management believes this number is necessary for proper management of the added Mission responsiblilities due to the full delegation for implementing the Greater Horn of Africa Initiative (GHAI), the USAID/Somalia program starting July 1998, the expanded DA-funded assistance for southern Sudan, and the increased FFP responsibilities.

The three positions above the target of 21 USDHs would be for a second Deputy Director, a D/G position and a PDO. With the increased responsibilities for the GHAI, Somalia and Sudan, the second Deputy Director would have particular management responsibilities for these areas. Without this position, the senior management oversight that these complex and sensitive areas deserve would be very difficult to provide. The D/G position is needed to adequately manage the Conflict Prevention aspects of the GHAI. While we have staff for implementing the Food Security program, we lack sufficient staff for the Conflict Prevention area. Not having this position would mean risking that the implementation of this area of the GHAI could be less than satisfactory. Finally, the increased responsibilities being given to REDSO/ESA has left us with a single USDH that can be dedicated exclusively to the program/project development area. Even with this PDO position, REDSO/ESA's abililty to provide PDO services to client Missions will be severely limited, and impossible without it.

FSN Salaries

FSN salary increases are projected to be 10% along with an additional automatic Within

Grade Increase of 5%.   Thus the total FSN pay increase is projected to be 15%.

USDH Costs

FY 99 has three replacements, 10 home leaves, and eight R&Rs budgeted.   The education allowance is projected to increase this fiscal year.   In FY 99, USAID/Kenya and REDSO/ESA plan to share 50% each of the costs of an EXO IDI.   This will continue in FY 00.   In order for the new REDSO/ESA program to succeed, REDSO/ESA management estimates a USDH staff of 24 will be adequate.   This number has been factored in the request budget.   Required are a Democracy and Governance Advisor, a PDO and a Senior management Officer.   The three will add up to the level of 21 currently approved (target).

Rent, Security, Utilities and Maintenance

The current warehouse lease is to expire which will cause an increase in the rental costs. The cost of generator fuel and the level of fuel consumption are both expected to rise, due to power infrastructure weaknesses.

NXP, Supplies and Freight

FY 99 includes an NXP budget of $155,000. These expenditures are in line with the R4 guidance to avoid pushing problems into the future, hence it is REDSO/ESA and USAID/Kenya policy to continue with the NXP procurement in an orderly, logical and cyclical fashion.

Like the FY 98 budget, no provision is made in the target levels for the purchase of ADP equipment to bring the system to Y2K compatibility.   The System Administrator estimates a requirement in FY 99 of $150,000.   REDSO/ESA's 60% share would be $90,000, which has been included in the Request Budget.

Overview of FY 00 OE Levels

The target level for FY 00 is $5,118,900 which is considered adequate to support 21 USDH, 56 FSNs and two USPSCs.   But REDSO/ESA will need a USDH presence of 24 to get the required results from the newly defined GHA region.   This number has been included in the Request Budget.   The minimum requested this FY is $5,667,400.

FSN Salaries

FSN salaries have been projected in the same fashion as the FY 99 projection.   A 10% pay increase as well as a 5% WGI is budgeted bringing the estimated increase to 15%.

USDH Costs

In FY 00, we have budgeted for six replacements, four home leaves, and 11 R&Rs.   The

education allowance is expected to increase this fiscal year.   This year REDSO/ESA will continue to pay 50% of the costs associated with an EXO IDI.

Rent, Security, Utilities, Maintenance, NXP, Supplies and Freight

These costs are expected to increase by 18% from FY 99 requested amounts with the exception of non-expendable property and expendable property/supplies.   This fiscal year will bring new office, warehouse and security contracts all of which are expected to involve increased costs.

Environmental Compliance

1. Issues Related to Implementation of 22 CFR Part 216 (Reg. 16) Requirements for REDSO/ESA SOs

Strategic Support Objective #1

No Reg 216 issues are associated with the provision of technical assistance to USAID Missions in the ESA   region.   Through its support, REDSO/ESA helps 1) ensure the environmental soundness of activities in all sectors and 2) contributes added value to environmental capacity building and natural resources management activities throughout the region.

Strategic Objective #2

REDSO/ESA supports two activities that have environmental review requirements pursuant to Reg 216. (Other activities are projects of Africa and Global Bureau, e.g. PARTS, HHRAA, D/G, EAGER, PEDS, WIDSR and TAACS, or are activities utilizing PD&S funds for project development.)

The Center for African Family Studies (CAFS) activity was accorded a Categorical Exclusion in October 1993, because the program entails nutrition, health care or population and family planning services and does not support interventions directly affecting the environment, such as construction or those that generate biomedical waste. This categorical exclusion remains valid and is expected to remain so for the duration of the CAFS project.

REDSO/ESA has enhanced responsibilities for regional agricultural research through support to ASARECA. Specific interventions under this activity are covered through a previous Africa Bureau IEE that requires application of an Environmental Screening Form followed by Environmental Reviews, if appropriate for a particular intervention, in accordance with Africa Bureau's *Environmental Guidelines for Small-Scale Activities in Africa* and Cable State 95 257896 (hereafter referred to as an "umbrella" IEE, as it is commonly known).

Partners have been apprised of the process and will be processing screening forms as needed. Although to-date, no new activities have been funded under REDSO/ESA's direction, the activity manager will be tracking the situation and screening forms and reviews will be submitted prior to implementation.

Strategic Objective #3

A HASP IEE utilizing the "umbrella" IEE procedures to screen and prepare reviews for specific grants and other activities was prepared and approved in September 1997. This IEE incorporates provisions for capacity building of grantee partners, through an Institutional Contractor that will manage the grant-making activity.   The only activities that have implemented to date are those covered by categorical exclusions of that IEE.

GHAI funding has supported the Water Hyacinth Control Program in Lake Victoria in conjunction with USAID/Uganda for which REDSO/ESA   prepared the IEE in 1996 with the requirement for an Environmental Assessment completed in FY 97. GHAI has also funded the Northern Uganda Food Security Project for which an "umbrella" IEE was completed in 1996 with conditions for the environmental screening and review of activities, which are the responsibility of USAID/Uganda.

Strategic Objective #4

All ongoing and future PL 480, Title II development food aid activities must have an approved IEE or Categorical Exclusion approved by the end of FY 98.   REDSO/ESA has provided assistance to Cooperating Sponsors to comply with Reg 216 procedures. REDSO/ESA regional FFP provided direct management of the southern Sudan humanitarian assistance program.

To the best of our knowledge activities in Burundi in FY 97 had no Reg. 216 implications that were not covered under those Missions' previous Reg. 216 documentation. In addition, the Sudan activities were international disaster assistance and emergency food aid and thus considered exemptions.

2.   Results Achieved to Accomplish Environmentally Sound Activities

REDSO/ESA has provided pivotal support in development and implementation of procedures for environmental screening and review through umbrella IEEs programs and supported Missions extensively in the preparation of IEEs.   In FY 97, REDSO/ESA assisted Missions to prepare several of the first Africa Bureau SO-level IEEs and Categorical Exclusions as well as craft innovative IEEs in South Africa, building upon South African environmental impact assessment procedures.   Several Missions and Mission Environmental Officers (MEOs) have been assisted in moving beyond compliance.   For example, REDSO/ESA was instrumental in assisting USAID/Mozambique to achieve an environmental SO.

REDSO/ESA has been a principal partner in developing and conducting the Regional Environmental Assessment (EA) Training Course for NGO and PVO partners (initially funded by REDSO/ESA in FY 95) in collaboration with AFR/SD/PSGE.   REDSO/ESA has contributed significantly to refinement and continued FY 97 application of Africa Bureau's *Environmental Guidelines for Small-Scale Activities in Africa* and its francophone translation. The course and the accompanying *Environmental Review Guidelines* have become models for communicating environmentally sound design and impact assessment principles and procedures to PVOs and NGOs.

In FY 97, REDSO/ESA   planned, organized and conducted, in collaboration with Missions and the AFR/SD/PSGE's ENCAP initiative, EA training courses in Madagascar and in Ethiopia, which was a pilot training activity for PL 480, Title II partners.   Follow-up EA training was conducted for CAMPFIRE in Zimbabwe. At the invitation of AFR/SD/PSGE and USAID/Mali, REDSO/ESA , because of its familiarity with the francophone version of

the course, conducted training for partners in Mali. In total, counting courses in Zimbabwe in FY 95, in Mozambique, Uganda and Tanzania in FY 96, and the 165 individuals trained in FY 97, over 340 NGO and PVO development partners have been trained in environmentally-sound design and environmental impact assessment.   The trainings have also supported three to five Africans per course as facilitator/participants, thus building enhanced host country capacity in environmental impact assessment.   Partners are applying the review procedures taught and some individuals have sought additional training in the subject.

In FY 97, REDSO/ESA   planned and organized the EA course for Kenya Wildlife Service (November 97 for 40 participants) and assisted AFR.SD/PSGE and BHR in planning and conducting two Africa-wide PL 480 Title II EA courses (one in December 97 for 50 participants, another planned for March 1998). In addition, REDSO/ESA   planned additional follow-up training for Zimbabwe CAMPFIRE Coordinators (November 1997 for 14 participants) and planned an MEO Training Course (February 1998).

A significant FY 97 REDSO/ESA   contribution to both the Africa region and USAID Title II activities worldwide is the development of the PL 480, Title II *Environmental Documentation Manual*, a step-by-step guide to compliance with USAID's environmental procedures.   REDSO/ESA is credited as the primary author of the *Environmental Documentation Manual*, conceived subsequent to the February 1997, EA course for Ethiopia's Title II Cooperating Sponsors. Known initially as the "Environmental Information Package," this guide was developed through collaboration of the Office of Food for Peace (BHR/FFP) and AFR/SD as well as the Environmental Working Groups organized by Food Aid Management (FAM) and USAID/Ethiopia. REDSO/ESA work with the Ethiopia Title II Environmental Working Group and field-based experience with Reg. 216 have shaped the manual, which was successfully tested in training 50 Title II partners in December 1997. This comprehensive tool explaining USAID environmental procedures has important ramifications beyond Title II and can be used with little adaptation by MEOs, SO Teams and others with Reg. 216 responsibilities.

As part of REDSO/ESA's continuing effort to achieve host country capacity in environmental impact assessment, REDSO/ESA's REA/REO is part of the donor team of experts assembled for the IUCN-World Bank initiative for Capacity Building in Sub-Saharan Africa (CEASSA). It has participated in the Africa-wide donor planning in Gland and elsewhere to carry out the agenda of the African Ministerial Council on Environment, upon which CEASSA is based, and is part of the local organizing team for the Nairobi-based FY 98 meeting.

3.   REDSO/ESA list of activities in FY 98 with requirements for IEEs and/or EAs:

Except for the technology diffusion activity in the agriculture strategic objective (SO) all other REDSO/ESA FY 98 activities qualify for a Categorical Exclusion.

REDSO/ESA is restructuring its strategy to incorporate six SOs and one SSO that, in turn, incorporate the activities of the previous strategy's SOs as well as REDSO/ESA new mandate to manage the GHAI.

The HASP will likely remain as a separate unit; its "umbrella" IEE will apply to all HASP activities, regardless of the SO to which they contribute. No changes to that IEE are contemplated. The HASP unit will ensure application of environmental screening and review procedures and fulfill the reporting requirements specified in the IEE.

Each new SO will require Reg. 216 documentation. SO Teams, in accordance with their duties under ADS 204, will become responsible for new SO-level IEEs or SO-level Categorical Exclusions. Depending on the complexity of an SO's activities and the need for specialized review or IEE conditions, separate documentation may be appropriate for individual Results Packages or Intermediate Results. Existing Reg. 216 documents, e.g., CAFS and ASARECA, must also be incorporated within the respective SOs to which they apply. Although the majority of activities within each SO will likely be in the realm of studies, information transfer, meetings and networking or health activities with no physical interventions, the possibility of grant-making activities, necessitating adoption of the "umbrella" IEE process, or the need for an Environmental Assessment cannot be excluded. The total number of Categorical Exclusion documents and/or IEEs cannot be properly estimated until the SOs have been defined in sufficient detail to permit analysis with the technical assistance of the REA/REO.

Although no Reg. 216 documentation would appear to be needed for the FY 98 request to fund two pilot programs in support of the GHAI aimed at enhancing USAID's efforts at making humanitarian assistance more effective and timely, this situation needs to be monitored by the responsible SO Team in conjunction with the BHR BEO (not Africa Bureau) to specify, in particular, the not yet clear, Bureau's definition of emergency food aid activities that can be covered by the Reg. 216 international disaster assistance exemption. Under both of these pilot activities, REDSO/ESA will be requesting BHR to re-delegate approval authority to program PL 480, Title II emergency programs (including monetization) and BHR/Office of Foreign Disaster Assistance funds (from the International Disaster Assistance account) to support innovative and pro-active interventions in transition countries, which reduce vulnerabilities and support local capacities so that vulnerable populations can meet more of their needs from local resources rather than relying so heavily on external assistance.

REDSO/ESA anticipates a continued requirement for BHR and possibly Development Assistance resources to work with the Sudanese populations. The Development Assistance funds will require preparation of a Categorical Exclusion or an IEE and, as noted above, the applicability of an exemption to the BHR resources will need to be confirmed.

USAID FY 2000 BUDGET REQUEST BY PROGRAM/COUNTRY

27-Aug-98
12:32 PM

Country/Program:
Scenario: Base Level

S.O. # , Title	Approp. Acct	Bilateral/Field Support	Est. SO Pipeline End of FY 99	Estimated Total	Basic Education	Agric.	Other Growth	Pop	Child Survival	Infectious Diseases	HIV/AIDS	Other Health	Environ	D/G	Est. Expend. FY 00	Est. Total Cost life of SO	Future Cost (POST 2000)	Year of Final Oblig.
SO01 - A More Open and Market-Driven Regional Economy																		
	DA	Bilateral	1,800	1,230	0	0	1,230	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2,000	9,780	6,000	02
		Field Spt	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
		Total	1,800	1,230	0	0	1,230	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2,000	9,780	6,000	
SO02 - Strengthened Regional African Capacity to Manage Conflict and Promote Good Governance																		
	DA	Bilateral	2,002	3,685	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3,685	2,800	15,287	7,700	02
		Field Spt	30	100	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	100	50	500	300	
		Total	2,032	3,785	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3,785	2,850	15,787	8,000	
SO03 - Increased Use of Market-Oriented Agricultural Technologies and Policies in the ESA Region																		
	DA	Bilateral	2,300	3,500	0	3,335	165	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2,800	14,820	8,000	02
		Field Spt	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
		Total	2,300	3,500	0	3,335	165	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2,800	14,820	8,000	
SO04 - Improved Child and Reproductive Health Systems in East and Southern Africa																		
	DA	Bilateral	1,400	3,225	0	0	0	250	2,775	0	0	200	0	0	3,000	11,197	6,000	02
		Field Spt	2,000	1,825	0	0	0	300	1,315	0	210	0	0	0	2,000	8,375	4,000	
		Total	3,400	5,050	0	0	0	550	4,090	0	210	200	0	0	5,000	19,572	10,000	
SO05 - Regional Promotion of Improved Environment/Natural Resources Management																		
	DA	Bilateral	1,600	2,540	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2,540	0	1,800	9,910	5,000	02
		Field Spt	200	400	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	400	0	300	1,750	1,000	
		Total	1,800	2,940	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2,940	0	2,100	11,660	6,000	
SO06 - More Effective Responses to Humanitarian Crises and Timely Transition Towards Greater Self Reliance																		
	DA	Bilateral	600	200	0	0	200	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	400	12,300	8,000	02
		Field Spt	0	3,300	0	0	1,150	0	0	0	0	0	0	2,150	2,000	0	0	
		Total	600	3,500	0	0	1,350	0	0	0	0	0	0	2,150	2,400	12,300	8,000	
SSO07 - Regional Support																		
	DA	Bilateral	2,200	8,235	0	0	8,235	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5,000	22,185	10,000	02
		Field Spt	200	260	0	0	260	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	300	1,520	1,000	
		Total	2,400	8,495	0	0	8,495	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5,300	23,705	11,000	
		Bilateral		0														
		Field Spt		0														
		Total	0	0	0			0	0	0		0	0	0	0	0	0	
Total Bilateral			11,902	22,615	0		9,830	250	2,775		0	200	2,540	3,685	17,800	95,479		
Total Field Support			2,430	5,885	0		1,410	300	1,315		210	0	400	2,250	4,650	12,145		
TOTAL PROGRAM			14,332	28,500	0	3,335	11,240	550	4,090	0	210	200	2,940	5,935	22,450	107,624	**57,000**	

FY 2000 Request Sector Totals -- DA	
Econ Growth	14,575
[Of which Microenterpris	0
HCD	
PHN	5,050
Environment	2,940
[Of which Biodiversity]	0
Democracy	5,935
Humanitarian	0

FY 2000 Request Sector Totals -- ESF	
Econ Growth	0
[Of which Microenterprise	[]
HCD	0
PHN	0
Environment	0
[Of which Biodiversity]	[]
Democracy	0
Humanitarian	0

FY 2001 Target Program Level	28,500
FY 2002 Target Program Level	28,500
FY 2003 Target Program Level	0

USAID FY 1999 Budget Request by Program/Country

27-Aug-98
12:32 PM

Country/Program:
Scenario: Base Level

S.O. # , Title Approp. Acct	Bilateral/Field Support	Est. SO Pipeline End of FY 98	Estimated Total	Basic Education	Agric.	Other Growth	Pop	Child Survival	Infectious Diseases	HIV/AIDS	Other Health	Environ	D/G	Est. Expend. FY 99	Est. Total Cost life of SO	Future Cost (POST 2000)	Year of Final Oblig.
SO01 - A More Open and Market-Driven Regional Economy																	
DA	Bilateral	2,000	2,550	0	0	2,550	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1,800	9,780	6,000	02
	Field Spt	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	Total	2,000	2,550	0	0	2,550	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1,800	9,780	6,000	
SO02 - Strengthened Regional African Capacity to Manage Conflict and Promote Good Governance																	
DA	Bilateral	2,402	3,902	0	0	1,572	0	0	0	0	0	0	2,330	2,002	15,287	7,700	02
	Field Spt	70	100	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	100	30	500	300	
	Total	2,472	4,002	0	0	1,572	0	0	0	0	0	0	2,430	2,032	15,787	8,000	
SO03 - Increased Use of Market-Oriented Agricultural Technologies and Policies in the ESA Region																	
DA	Bilateral	2,320	3,320	0	3,107	213	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2,300	14,820	8,000	02
	Field Spt	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	Total	2,320	3,320	0	3,107	213	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2,300	14,820	8,000	
SO04 - Improved Child and Reproductive Health Systems in East and Southern Africa																	
DA	Bilateral	1,472	1,972	0	0	95	0	1,775	0	0	102	0	0	1,400	11,197	6,000	02
	Field Spt	2,050	2,550	0	0	0	325	1,975	0	250	0	0	0	2,000	8,375	4,000	
	Total	3,522	4,522	0	0	95	325	3,750	0	250	102	0	0	3,400	19,572	10,000	
SO05 - Regional Promotion of Improved Environment/Natural Resources Management																	
DA	Bilateral	1,800	2,370	0	40	130	0	0	0	0	0	2,200	0	1,600	9,910	5,000	02
	Field Spt	200	350	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	350	0	200	1,750	1,000	
	Total	2,000	2,720	0	40	130	0	0	0	0	0	2,550	0	1,800	11,660	6,000	
SO06 - More Effective Responses to Humanitarian Crises and Timely Transition Towards Greater Self Reliance																	
DA	Bilateral	600	800	0	0	800	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	600	12,300	8,000	02
	Field Spt	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	Total	600	800	0	0	800	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	600	12,300	8,000	
SSO07 - Regional Support																	
DA	Bilateral	2,450	3,950	0	0	3,950	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2,200	22,185	10,000	02
	Field Spt	200	260	0	0	260	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	200	1,520	1,000	
	Total	2,650	4,210	0	0	4,210	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2,400	23,705	11,000	
Trade and Investment Initiative																	
DA	Bilateral	0	450	0	0	450	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	450	450	0	99
	Field Spt	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	Total	0	450	0	0	450	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	450	450	0	
Total Bilateral		13,044	19,314	0	3,147	9,760	0	1,775	0	0	102	2,200	2,330	12,352	95,929		
Total Field Support		2,520	3,260	0	0	260	325	1,975	0	250	0	350	100	2,430	12,145		
TOTAL PROGRAM		15,564	22,574	0	3,147	10,020	325	3,750	0	250	102	2,550	2,430	14,782	108,074	**57,000**	

FY 1999 Request Sector Totals -- DA	
Econ Growth	13,167
[Of which Microenterpris	0
HCD	0
PHN	4,427
Environment	2,550
[Of which Biodiversity]	0
Democracy	2,430
Humanitarian	0

FY 1999 Request Sector Totals -- ESF	
Econ Growth	0
[Of which Microenterprise	[]
HCD	0
PHN	0
Environment	0
[Of which Biodiversity]	[]
Democracy	0
Humanitarian	0

FY 2001 Target Program Level	28,500
FY 2002 Target Program Level	28,500
FY 2003 Target Program Level	0

USAID FY 1998 Budget Request by Program/Country

27-Aug-98
12:32 PM

Country/Program:
Scenario: Base Level

S.O. # , Title	Approp. Acct	Bilateral/Field Support	Est. SO Pipeline End of FY 97	Estimated Total	Basic Education	Agric.	Other Growth	Pop	Child Survival	Infectious Diseases	HIV/AIDS	Other Health	Environ	D/G	Est. Expend. FY 98	Est. Total Cost life of SO	Future Cost (POST 2000)	Year of Final Oblig.
SO02 - Increase Utilization of Critical Information by USAID and Other Decision-Makers in the Region																		
	DA	Bilateral	2,404	955	0	100	355	120	250	0	30	100	0	0	2,500	30,756	0	98
		Field Spt	430	1,685	0	0	0	300	1,034	0	100	251	0	0	1,200	3,224		
		Total	2,834	2,640	0	100	355	420	1,284	0	130	351	0	0	3,700	33,980	0	
SO03 - Establish a Strong Basis for Implementation of the GHAI																		
	DA	Bilateral	11,297	12,995	0	1,000	7,240	0	0	0	0	0	620	4,135	5,000	42,216	0	98
		Field Spt	55	2,005	0	0	260	0	1,600	0	0	0	80	65	1,500	2,531		
		Total	11,352	15,000	0	1,000	7,500	0	1,600	0	0	0	700	4,200	6,500	44,747	0	
SSO01 - Effective Program and Technical Support to All ESA Missions																		
	DA	Bilateral	1,952	3,041	0	535	1,076	0	580	0	0	200	381	269	2,000	8,748	0	98
	DA	Field Spt	550	930	0	0	0	150	550	0	230	0	0	0	650	4,100		
		Total	2,502	3,971	0	535	1,076	150	1,130	0	230	200	381	269	2,650	12,848	0	
SSO04 - Effective Delivery USAID's of Humanitarian Assistance																		
		Bilateral	0														0	98
		Field Spt	0															
		Total	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0			0	
		Bilateral	0														0	XX
		Field Spt	0															
		Total	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0			0	
		Bilateral	0														0	XX
		Field Spt	0															
		Total	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0			0	
		Bilateral	0															
		Field Spt	0															
		Total	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0			0	
		Bilateral	0															
		Field Spt	0															
		Total	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0			0	
Total Bilateral			15,653	16,991	0	1,635	8,671	120	830	0	30	300	1,001	4,404	9,500	81,720		
Total Field Support			1,035	4,620	0	0	260	450	3,184	0	330	251	80	65	3,350	9,855		
TOTAL PROGRAM			16,688	21,611	0	1,635	8,931	570	4,014	0	360	551	1,081	4,469	12,850	91,575	**0**	

FY 1998 Request Sector Totals -- DA	
Econ Growth	10,466
[Of which Microenterpris	100
HCD	0
PHN	5,495
Environment	1,081
[Of which Biodiversity]	0
Democracy	4,469
Humanitarian	0

FY 1998 Request Sector Totals -- ESF	
Econ Growth	0
[Of which Microenterprise	[]
HCD	0
PHN	0
Environment	0
[Of which Biodiversity]	[]
Democracy	0
Humanitarian	0

FY 2001 Target Program Level	28,500
FY 2002 Target Program Level	28,500
FY 2003 Target Program Level	0

GLOBAL FIELD SUPPORT

Objective Name	Field Support: Activity Title & Number	Priority *	Duration	Estimated Funding ($000)					
				FY 1998 Obligated by:		FY 1999 Obligated by:		FY 2000 Obligated by:	
				Operating Unit	Global Bureau	Operating Unit	Global Bureau	Operating Unit	Global Bureau

Objective Name	Field Support: Activity Title & Number	Priority *	Duration	Estimated Funding ($000)					
				FY 1998 Obligated by:		FY 1999 Obligated by:		FY 2000 Obligated by:	
				Operating Unit	Global Bureau	Operating Unit	Global Bureau	Operating Unit	Global Bureau
S.S.O. 1: Effective Program & Technical Support to All ESA Missions	Private Enterprise Development Support (940-0026)	High	1	250	0	0	0	0	0
S.S.O.1: A More Open and Market-Driven Regional Economy	Private Enterprise Development Support - USPSC & FSN (940-0026)	High	2	0	0	350	0	365	0
S.S.O. 1: Effective Program & Technical Support to All ESA Missions	Women in Development Strategy & Resources (WIDSR) (936-0100)	High	1	80	0	0	0	0	0
S.S.O.1: A More Open and Market-Driven Regional Economy	Women in Development Strategy & Resources (WIDSR) (936-0100)	High	2	0	0	90	0	95	0
S.O.2: Increased Use of Critical Information by USAID and Other Decision-Makers in the Region	PATHFINDER/Adolescent Reproduction Health (936-3062)	High	1	0	351	0	0	0	0
S.O.4: Improved Child and Reproductive Health Systems in East and Southern Africa	PATHFINDER/Adolescent Reproduction Health (936-3062)	High	2	0	0	100	0	0	0
S.O.2: Increased Use of Critical Information by USAID and Other Decision-Makers in the Region	Partnerships for Health Reform/Health Care Financing Advisor (936-5974.13)	High	1	0	200	0	0	0	0
S.O.4: Improved Child and Reproductive Health Systems in East and Southern Africa	Health Reform Partnerships/Health Care Financing Advisor (936-5974.13)	High	1	0	0	0	100	0	0
S.O.2: Increased Use of Critical Information by USAID and Other Decision-Makers in the Region	FRONTIERS/Dual Methods (936-3086)	High	1	0	100	0	0	0	0
S.O.2: Increased Use of Critical Information by USAID and Other Decision-Makers in the Region	AVSC/Quality of Care (936-3068)	High	1	0	200	0	0	0	0
S.O.4: Improved Child and Reproductive Health Systems in East and Southern Africa	AVSC/Quality of Care (936-3068)	High	1	0	0	0	100	0	0
S.O.2: Increased Use of Critical Information by USAID and Other Decision-Makers in the Region	Policy/post-Abortion Care (936-3078)	High	1	0	150	0	0	0	0
S.O.4: Improved Child and Reproductive Health Systems in East and Southern Africa	Policy/post-Abortion Care (936-3078)	High	1	0	0	0	100	0	0

GLOBAL FIELD SUPPORT

Objective Name	Field Support: Activity Title & Number	Priority *	Duration	Estimated Funding ($000)					
				FY 1998 Obligated by:		FY 1999 Obligated by:		FY 2000 Obligated by:	
				Operating Unit	Global Bureau	Operating Unit	Global Bureau	Operating Unit	Global Bureau
S.O.2: Increased Use of Critical Information by USAID and Other Decision-Makers in the Region	FPLM/Logistics (936-3038.02)	High	1	0	300	0	0	0	0
S.O.4: Improved Child and Reproductive Health Systems in East and Southern Africa	FPLM/Logistics (936-3038.02)	High	1	0	0	0	100	0	0
S.S.O. 1: Effective Program & Technical Support to All ESA Missions	POP LeadersProgram/Western Consortium - 2 Fellows (936-3070)	High	1	0	450	0	0	0	0
S.O.4: Improved Child and Reproductive Health Systems in East and Southern Africa	POP LeadersProgram/Western Consortium - 2 Fellows (936-3070)	High	2	0	0	0	525	0	625
S.S.O. 1: Effective Program & Technical Support to All ESA Missions	TAACS - HIV/AIDS Advisor (936-5970)	High	1	0	325	0	0	0	0
S.O.4: Improved Child and Reproductive Health Systems in East and Southern Africa	TAACS - HIV/AIDS Advisor (936-5970)	High	2	0	0	0	300	0	325
S.S.O. 1: Effective Program & Technical Support to All ESA Missions	Michigan Population Fellow (936-3054)	High	1	0	200	0	0	0	0
S.O.4: Improved Child and Reproductive Health Systems in East and Southern Africa	Michigan Population Fellow (936-3054)	High	1	0	0	0	100	0	0
S.O.3: Establish a Strong Basis for Implementation of the GHAI	Linkages (936-3082.01)	High	1	0	300	0	0	0	0
S.O.3: Establish a Strong Basis for Implementation of the GHAI	Measure (936 - 3083.01)	High	1	0	250	0	0	0	0
S.O.3: Establish a Strong Basis for Implementation of the GHAI	Prime (936-3072)	High	1	0	250	0	0	0	0
S.O.3: Establish a Strong Basis for Implementation of the GHAI	Quality Assurance Project (936-5992.02)	High	1	0	300	0	0	0	0
S.O.3: Establish a Strong Basis for Implementation of the GHAI	Reg. Intergrated Coastal Mgnt Capacity Building(936-5517)	High	1	0	30	0	0	0	0
S.O.5: Regional Promotion of Improved E/NRM	Reg. Intergrated Coastal Mgnt Capacity Building(936-5517)	High	1	0	0	0	150	0	150
S.O.3: Establish a Strong Basis for Implementation of the GHAI	CRSP - Prgram: Small Ruminants (931-1328)	High	1	0	50	0	0	0	0
S.O.5: Regional Promotion of Improved E/NRM	CRSP - Prgram: Small Ruminants (931-1328)	High	1	0	0	0	200	0	250
S.O.3: Establish a Strong Basis for Implementation of the GHAI	D/G Project - USPSC, FSN & Fellow (936-5366)	High	1	330	65	0	0	0	0
S.O.2: Strengthened Regional African Capacity to Manage Conflict and Promote Good Governance	D/G Project - USPSC, FSN & Fellow (936-5366)	High	2	0	0	345	100	360	100

GLOBAL FIELD SUPPORT

Objective Name	Field Support: Activity Title & Number	Priority *	Duration	Estimated Funding ($000)					
				FY 1998 Obligated by:		FY 1999 Obligated by:		FY 2000 Obligated by:	
				Operating Unit	Global Bureau	Operating Unit	Global Bureau	Operating Unit	Global Bureau
S.O.3: Establish a Strong Basis for Implementation of the GHAI	AAAS Fellow - REDSO/ESA (936-5861)	High	1	0	175	0	0	0	0
S.S.O.7: Regional Support	AAAS Fellow - REDSO/ESA (936-5861)	High	2	0	0	0	175	0	175
S.O.3: Establish a Strong Basis for Implementation of the GHAI	AAAS Fellow - GHAI/W (936-5861)	High	1	0	85	0	0	0	0
S.S.O.7: Regional Support	AAAS Fellow - GHAI/W (936-5861)	High	2	0	0	0	85	0	85

GRAND TOTAL.......9,891

* For Priorities use high, medium-high, medium, medium-low, low

0

Org.REDSO/ESA FY 1998 On-Board Estimate	SO/SpO Staff				Total SO/SpO Staff	Management Staff						Total Mgmt.	Grand Total Staff
	SSO 1	SO 2	SO 3	SSO 4		Org. Mgmt.	Con-troller	AMS/EXO	Con-tract	Legal	All Other		
U.S. Direct Hire	5	2.5	1	2.5	11	2	3		3	2	2	12	23
Other U.S. Citizens: 1/													
OE Internationally Recruited												0	0
OE Locally Recruited						1					1	2	2
Program	5.5	6	1.5		13							0	13
FSN/TCN Direct Hire:													
OE Internationally Recruited					0							0	0
OE Locally Recruited					0		1					1	1
FSN/TCN Non-Direct Hire:													
OE Internationally Recruited					0							0	0
OE Locally Recruited		1		3	4	1	36		5	3	7	52	56
Program	1	2	3		6							0	6
Total Staff Levels	11.5	11.5	5.5	5.5	34	4	40	0	8	5	10	67	101
TAACS					0							0	0
Fellows	0.5	0.5	3		4							0	4

1/ Excluding TAACS and Fellows

Org.REDSO/ESA FY 1999 Target On-Board Estimate	SO/SpO Staff							Total SO/SpO Staff	Management Staff						Total Mgmt.	Grand Total Staff
	SO 1	SO 2	SO 3	SO 4	SO 5	SO 6	SSO 7		Org. Mgmt.	Con-troller	AMS/ EXO	Con-tract	Legal	All Other		
U.S. Direct Hire	1	1	1.5	1	0	2.5		7	2	3		4	2	3	14	21
Other U.S. Citizens: 1/																
OE Internationally Recruited								0							0	0
OE Locally Recruited								0	1			1		1	3	3
Program	1	1.5	2	3	5	2	3	17.5						0.5	0.5	18
FSN/TCN Direct Hire:																
OE Internationally Recruited								0							0	0
OE Locally Recruited								0		1					1	1
FSN/TCN Non-Direct Hire:																
OE Internationally Recruited								0							0	0
OE Locally Recruited	1.5	0.5	1.5	1.5	1	2		8	1	34		6	2	4	47	55
Program	3	3	2	0	1	2	8	19							0	19
Total Staff Levels	6.5	6	7	5.5	7	8.5	11	51.5	4	38	0	11	4	8.5	65.5	117
TAACS				1				1							0	1
Fellows	1	1	0.5	3.5		1	1	8							0	8

1/ Excluding TAACS and Fellows

Org.REDSO/ESA FY 1999 Request On-Board Estimate	SO/SpO Staff							Total SO/SpO Staff	Management Staff						Total Mgmt.	Grand Total Staff
	SO 1	SO 2	SO 3	SO 4	SO 5	SO 6	SSO 7		Org. Mgmt.	Con-troller	AMS/ EXO	Con-tract	Legal	All Other		
U.S. Direct Hire	1	2	1.5	1	0	2.5	0	8	3	3		4	2	4	16	24
Other U.S. Citizens: 1/																
OE Internationally Recruited								0							0	0
OE Locally Recruited								0	1	0	0	1	0	1	3	3
Program	1	1.5	2	3	5	2	3	17.5	0	0	0	0	0	0.5	0.5	18
FSN/TCN Direct Hire:																
OE Internationally Recruited								0							0	0
OE Locally Recruited								0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	1
FSN/TCN Non-Direct Hire:																
OE Internationally Recruited								0							0	0
OE Locally Recruited	1.5	0.5	1.5	1.5	1	2	0	8	1	34	0	7	3	5	50	58
Program	3	3	2	0	1	2	8	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19
Total Staff Levels	6.5	7	7	5.5	7	8.5	11	52.5	5	38	0	12	5	10.5	70.5	123
TAACS	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Fellows	1	1	0.5	3.5	0	1	1	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8

1/ Excluding TAACS and Fellows

Org.REDSO/ESA FY 2000 Target On-Board Estimate	SO/SpO Staff							Total SO/SpO Staff	Management Staff						Total Mgmt.	Grand Total Staff
	SO 1	SO 2	SO 3	SO 4	SO 5	SO 6	SSO 7		Org. Mgmt.	Con-troller	AMS/ EXO	Con-tract	Legal	All Other		
U.S. Direct Hire	1	1	1.5	1	0	2.5		7	2	3		4	2	3	14	21
Other U.S. Citizens: 1/																
OE Internationally Recruited								0							0	0
OE Locally Recruited								0	1			1		1	3	3
Program	1	1.5	2	3	5	2	3	17.5						0.5	0.5	18
FSN/TCN Direct Hire:																
OE Internationally Recruited								0							0	0
OE Locally Recruited								0		1					1	1
FSN/TCN Non-Direct Hire:																
OE Internationally Recruited								0							0	0
OE Locally Recruited	1.5	0.5	1.5	1.5	1	2		8	1	34		7	3	5	50	58
Program	3	3	2		1	2	8	19							0	19
Total Staff Levels	6.5	6	7	5.5	7	8.5	11	51.5	4	38	0	12	5	9.5	68.5	120
TAACS				1				1							0	1
Fellows	1	1	0.5	3.5		1	1	8							0	8

1/ Excluding TAACS and Fellows

Org.REDSO/ESA FY 2000 Request On-Board Estimate	SO/SpO Staff							Total SO/SpO Staff	Management Staff						Total Mgmt.	Grand Total Staff
	SO 1	SO 2	SO 3	SO 4	SO 5	SO 6	SSO 7		Org. Mgmt.	Con-troller	AMS/ EXO	Con-tract	Legal	All Other		
U.S. Direct Hire	1	2	1.5	1	0	2.5		8	3	3		4	2	4	16	24
Other U.S. Citizens: 1/																
OE Internationally Recruited								0							0	0
OE Locally Recruited								0	1			1		1	3	3
Program	1	1.5	2	3	5	2	3	17.5						0.5	0.5	18
FSN/TCN Direct Hire:																
OE Internationally Recruited								0							0	0
OE Locally Recruited								0		1					1	1
FSN/TCN Non-Direct Hire:																
OE Internationally Recruited								0							0	0
OE Locally Recruited	1.5	0.5	1.5	1.5	1	2		8	1	34		7	3	5	50	58
Program	3	3	2		1	2	8	19							0	19
Total Staff Levels	6.5	7	7	5.5	7	8.5	11	52.5	5	38	0	12	5	10.5	70.5	123
TAACS				1				1							0	1
Fellows	1	1	0.5	3.5		1	1	8							0	8

1/ Excluding TAACS and Fellows

Org.REDSO/ESA FY 2001 On-Board Estimate	SO/SpO Staff							Total SO/SpO Staff	Management Staff						Total Mgmt.	Grand Total Staff
	SO 1	SO 2	SO 3	SO 4	SO 5	SO 6	SSO 7		Org. Mgmt.	Con-troller	AMS/ EXO	Con-tract	Legal	All Other		
U.S. Direct Hire	1	2	1.5	1	0	2.5		8	3	3		4	2	4	16	24
Other U.S. Citizens: 1/																
OE Internationally Recruited								0							0	0
OE Locally Recruited								0	1			1		1	3	3
Program	1	1.5	2	3	5	2	3	17.5						0.5	0.5	18
FSN/TCN Direct Hire:																
OE Internationally Recruited								0							0	0
OE Locally Recruited								0		1					1	1
FSN/TCN Non-Direct Hire:																
OE Internationally Recruited								0							0	0
OE Locally Recruited	1.5	0.5	1.5	1.5	1	2		8	1	34		7	3	5	50	58
Program	3	3	2		1	2	8	19							0	19
Total Staff Levels	6.5	7	7	5.5	7	8.5	11	52.5	5	38	0	12	5	10.5	70.5	123
TAACS				1				1							0	1
Fellows	1	1	0.5	3.5		1	1	8							0	8

1/ Excluding TAACS and Fellows

Org.REDSO/ESA Summary On-Board Estimate	SSO 1	SO 2	SO 3	SSO 4	Total SO/SpO Staff	Org. Mgmt.	Con-troller	AMS/ EXO	Con-tract	Legal	All Other	Total Mgmt.	Grand Total Staff
FY 1998:													
U.S. Direct Hire	5	2.5	1	2.5	11	2	3		3	2	2	12	23
OE Internationally Recruited	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
OE Locally Recruited	0	0	0	0	4	1	37	0	5	3	8	55	59
Total OE Funded Staff	5	2.5	1	2.5	15	3	40	0	8	5	10	67	82
Program Funded	6.5	8	4.5	0	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19
Total FY 1998	11.5	10.5	5.5	2.5	34	3	40	0	8	5	10	67	101

	SO 1	SO 2	SO 3	SO 4	SO5	SO6	SSO7	Total SO/SpO Staff	Org. Mgmt.	Con-troller	AMS/ EXO	Con-tract	Legal	All Other	Total Mgmt.	Grand Total Staff
FY 1999 Target:																
U.S. Direct Hire	1	1	1.5	1	0	2.5		7	2	3		4	2	3	14	21
OE Internationally Recruited	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
OE Locally Recruited	1.5	0.5	1.5	1.5	1	2	0	8	2	35	0	7	2	5	51	59
Total OE Funded Staff	2.5	1.5	3	2.5	1	4.5	0	15	4	38	0	11	4	8	65	80
Program Funded	4	4.5	4	3	6	4	11	36.5	0	0	0	0	0	0.5	0.5	37
Total FY 1999 Target	6.5	6	7	5.5	7	8.5	11	51.5	4	38	0	11	4	8.5	65.5	117
FY 1999 Request:																
U.S. Direct Hire	1	2	1.5	1	0	2.5	0	8	3	3		4	2	4	16	24
OE Internationally Recruited	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
OE Locally Recruited	1.5	0.5	1.5	1.5	1	2	0	8	2	35	0	8	3	6	54	62
Total OE Funded Staff	2.5	2.5	3	2.5	1	4.5	0	16	5	38	0	12	5	10	70	86
Program Funded	4	4.5	4	3	6	4	11	36.5	0	0	0	0	0	0.5	0.5	37
Total FY 1999 Request	6.5	7	7	5.5	7	8.5	11	52.5	5	38	0	12	5	10.5	70.5	123
FY 2000 Target:																
U.S. Direct Hire	1	1	1.5	1	0	2.5	0	7	2	3		4	2	3	14	21
OE Internationally Recruited	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
OE Locally Recruited	1.5	0.5	1.5	1.5	1	2	0	8	2	35	0	8	3	6	54	62
Total OE Funded Staff	2.5	1.5	3	2.5	1	4.5	0	15	4	38	0	12	5	9	68	83
Program Funded	4	4.5	4	3	6	4	11	36.5	0	0	0	0	0	0.5	0.5	37
Total FY 2000 Target	6.5	6	7	5.5	7	8.5	11	51.5	4	38	0	12	5	9.5	68.5	120
FY 2000 Request:																
U.S. Direct Hire	1	2	1.5	1	0	2.5	0	8	3	3		4	2	4	16	24
OE Internationally Recruited	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
OE Locally Recruited	1.5	0.5	1.5	1.5	1	2	0	8	2	35	0	8	3	6	54	62
Total OE Funded Staff	2.5	2.5	3	2.5	1	4.5	0	16	5	38	0	12	5	10	70	86
Program Funded	4	4.5	4	3	6	4	11	36.5	0	0	0	0	0	0.5	0.5	37
Total FY 2000 Request	6.5	7	7	5.5	7	8.5	11	52.5	5	38	0	12	5	10.5	70.5	123
FY 2001 Estimate:																
U.S. Direct Hire	1	2	1.5	1	0	2.5	0	8	3	3		4	2	4	16	24
OE Internationally Recruited	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
OE Locally Recruited	1.5	0.5	1.5	1.5	1	2	0	8	2	35	0	8	3	6	54	62
Total OE Funded Staff	2.5	2.5	3	2.5	1	4.5	0	16	5	38	0	12	5	10	70	86
Program Funded	4	4.5	4	3	6	4	11	36.5	0	0	0	0	0	0.5	0.5	37
Total FY 2001 Target	6.5	7	7	5.5	7	8.5	11	52.5	5	38	0	12	5	10.5	70.5	123

MISSION : REDSO/ESA - Target   **MISSION :** REDSO/ESA - Request:

USDH STAFFING REQUIREMENTS BY SKILL CODE

BACKSTOP (BS)	No. of USDH Employees In Backstop FY 98	No. of USDH Employees In Backstop FY 99	No. of USDH Employees In Backstop FY 2000	No. of USDH Employees In Backstop FY 2001
01SMG	2	2	2	2
02 Program Off.	0	2	2	2
03 EXO				
04 Controller	3	3	3	3
05/06/07 Secretary				
10 Agriculture.	1	1	1	1
11Economics	2	2	2	2
12 GDO	1	1	1	1
12 Democracy				
14 Rural Dev.				
15 Food for Peace	3	2	2	2
21 Private Ent.				
25 Engineering				
40 Environ				
50 Health/Pop.	1	1	1	1
60 Education				
75 Physical Sci.				
85 Legal	2	2	2	2
92 Commodity Mgt				
93 Contract Mgt	4	4	4	4
94 PDO	3	1	1	1
95 IDI	1	0	0	0
Other*				
TOTAL	23	21	21	21

*please list occupations covered by other if there are any

USDH STAFFING REQUIREMENTS BY SKILL CODE

BACKSTOP (BS)	No. of USDH Employees In Backstop FY 98	No. of USDH Employees In Backstop FY 99	No. of USDH Employees In Backstop FY 2000	No. of USDH Employees In Backstop FY 2001
01SMG	2	3	3	3
02 Program Off.	0	2	2	2
03 EXO				
04 Controller	3	3	3	3
05/06/07 Secretary				
10 Agriculture.	1	1	1	1
11Economics	2	2	2	2
12 GDO	1	1	1	1
12 Democracy	0	1	1	1
14 Rural Dev.				
15 Food for Peace	3	2	2	2
21 Private Ent.				
25 Engineering				
40 Environ				
50 Health/Pop.	1	1	1	1
60 Education				
75 Physical Sci.				
85 Legal	2	2	2	2
92 Commodity Mgt				
93 Contract Mgt	4	4	4	4
94 PDO	3	2	2	2
95 IDI	1	0	0	0
Other*				
TOTAL	23	24	24	24

*please list occupations covered by other if there are any

Orgno:.   623
Org. Title: REDSO/ESA

Foreign National Voluntary Separation Account

Action	FY 98			FY 99			FY 00		
	OE	Program	Total	OE	Program	Total	OE	Program	Total
Deposits	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Withdrawals	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

Unfunded Liability (if any)
   at the end of each FY.

Local Currency Trust Funds - Regular ($000s)

	FY 98	FY 99	FY 00
Balance Start of Year	0.0	0.0	0.0
Obligations	0.0	0.0	0.0
Deposits	0.0	0.0	0.0
Balance End of Year	0.0	0.0	0.0

Exchange Rate(s) Used

Trust Funds in Dollar Equivalents, not in Local Country Equivalents

Local Currency Trust Funds - Real Property ($000s)

	FY 98	FY 99	FY 00
Balance Start of Year	0.0	0.0	0.0
Obligations	0.0	0.0	0.0
Deposits	0.0	0.0	0.0
Balance End of Year	0.0	0.0	0.0

Trust Funds in Dollar Equivalents, not in Local Country Equivalents

fn-21623.wk4

Org. Title:	**REDSO EA**		Overseas Mission Budgets													
Org. No:	623		FY 1998			FY 1999 Target			FY 1999 Request			FY 2000 Target			FY 2000 Request		
OC			Dollars	TF	Total	Dollars	TF	Total	Dollars	TF	Total	Dollars	TF	Total	Dollars	TF	Total
11.1	Base Pay & pymt. for annual leave balances - FNDH		40.1		40.1	42.6		42.6	42.6		42.6	48.5		48.5	48.5		48.5
	Subtotal OC 11.1		40.1	0	40.1	42.6	0	42.6	42.6	0	42.6	48.5	0	48.5	48.5	0	48.5
11.3	Personnel comp. - other than full-time permanent		Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line		
11.3	Base Pay & pymt. for annual leave balances - FNDH				0			0			0			0			0
	Subtotal OC 11.3		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
11.5	Other personnel compensation		Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line		
11.5	USDH				0			0			0			0			0
11.5	FNDH				0			0			0			0			0
	Subtotal OC 11.5		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
11.8	Special personal services payments		Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line		
11.8	USPSC Salaries		124.6		124.6	0		0	0		0	0		0	0		0
11.8	FN PSC Salaries		630.1		630.1	661.5		661.5	661.5		661.5	694.6		694.6	694.6		694.6
11.8	IPA/Details-In/PASAs/RSSAs Salaries				0			0			0			0			0
	Subtotal OC 11.8		754.7	0	754.7	661.5	0	661.5	661.5	0	661.5	694.6	0	694.6	694.6	0	694.6
12.1	Personnel benefits		Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line		
12.1	USDH benefits		Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line		
12.1	Educational Allowances		60.8		60.8	55.6		55.6	55.6		55.6	55.6		55.6	55.6		55.6
12.1	Cost of Living Allowances		7.4		7.4	10.5		10.5	10.5		10.5	10.8		10.8	10.8		10.8
12.1	Home Service Transfer Allowances		2.6		2.6	0		0	0		0	0		0	0		0
12.1	Quarters Allowances		0		0	0		0	0		0	0		0	0		0
12.1	Other Misc. USDH Benefits		3.7		3.7	5.6		5.6	5.6		5.6	5.6		5.6	5.6		5.6
12.1	FNDH Benefits		Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line		
12.1	Payments to the FSN Separation Fund - FNDH				0			0			0			0			0
12.1	Other FNDH Benefits		12.8		12.8	13.9		13.9	13.9		13.9	13.9		13.9	13.9		13.9
12.1	US PSC Benefits				0			0			0			0			0
12.1	FN PSC Benefits		Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line		
12.1	Payments to the FSN Separation Fund - FN PSC				0			0			0			0			0
12.1	Other FN PSC Benefits		145.3		145.3	152		152	152		152	148.6		148.6	148.6		148.6
12.1	IPA/Detail-In/PASA/RSSA Benefits				0			0			0			0			0
	Subtotal OC 12.1		232.6	0	232.6	237.6	0	237.6	237.6	0	237.6	234.5	0	234.5	234.5	0	234.5
13	Benefits for former personnel		Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line		
13	FNDH		Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line		
13	Severance Payments for FNDH				0			0			0			0			0
13	Other Benefits for Former Personnel - FNDH				0			0			0			0			0
13	FN PSCs		Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line		
13	Severance Payments for FN PSCs				0			0			0			0			0
13	Other Benefits for Former Personnel - FN PSCs				0			0			0			0			0
	Subtotal OC 13.0		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
21	Travel and transportation of persons		Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line		
21	Training Travel		13.2		13.2	13.2		13.2	13.2		13.2	13.2		13.2	13.2		13.2
21	Mandatory/Statutory Travel		Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line		
21	Post Assignment Travel - to field		12.5		12.5	0		0	0		0	0		0	0		0
21	Assignment to Washington Travel		0		0	0		0	0		0	0		0	0		0

Line	Description															
21	Home Leave Travel	0		0	0		0	0		0	22.5		22.5	0		0
21	R & R Travel	0		0	22.5		22.5	22.5		22.5	0		0	0		0
21	Education Travel	0		0	0		0	0		0	0		0	0		0
21	Evacuation Travel	2.7		2.7	3		3	3.2		3.2	3		3	3.2		3.2
21	Retirement Travel	0		0	0		0	0		0	0		0	0		0
21	Pre-Employment Invitational Travel			0			0			0			0			0
21	Other Mandatory/Statutory Travel			0			0			0			0			0
21	Operational Travel	Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line		
21	Site Visits - Headquarters Personnel	0		0	0		0	0		0	0		0	0		0
21	Site Visits - Mission Personnel	60		60	68		68	68		68	68		68	68		68
21	Conferences/Seminars/Meetings/Retreats	30.3		30.3	30.3		30.3	30.3		30.3	19.3		19.3	19.3		19.3
21	Assessment Travel			0			0			0			0			0
21	Impact Evaluation Travel			0			0			0			0			0
21	Disaster Travel (to respond to specific disasters)			0			0			0			0			0
21	Recruitment Travel			0			0			0			0			0
21	Other Operational Travel	2.8		2.8	3.6		3.6	3.6		3.6	3.6		3.6	3.6		3.6
	Subtotal OC 21.0	121.5	0	121.5	140.6	0	140.6	140.8	0	140.8	129.6	0	129.6	107.3	0	107.3
22	Transportation of things	Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line		
22	Post assignment freight	56.8		56.8	0		0	0		0	0		0	0		0
22	Home Leave Freight	0		0	0		0	0		0	30		30	30		30
22	Retirement Freight	0		0	0		0	0		0	0		0	0		0
22	Transportation/Freight for Office Furniture/Equip.	28.3		28.3	9.1		9.1	9.1		9.1	0		0	0		0
22	Transportation/Freight for Res. Furniture/Equip.	3.5		3.5	2		2	2		2	0		0	0		0
	Subtotal OC 22.0	88.6	0	88.6	11.1	0	11.1	11.1	0	11.1	30	0	30	30	0	30
23.2	Rental payments to others	Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line		
23.2	Rental Payments to Others - Office Space	46.6		46.6	47.1		47.1	47.1		47.1	54.2		54.2	54.2		54.2
23.2	Rental Payments to Others - Warehouse Space	3.5		3.5	3.5		3.5	3.5		3.5	4		4	4		4
23.2	Rental Payments to Others - Residences	55.8		55.8	54		54	54		54	59		59	59		59
	Subtotal OC 23.2	105.9	0	105.9	104.6	0	104.6	104.6	0	104.6	117.2	0	117.2	117.2	0	117.2
23.3	Communications, utilities, and miscellaneous charges	Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line		
23.3	Office Utilities	7.5		7.5	9		9	9		9	9		9	9		9
23.3	Residential Utilities	10		10	10.5		10.5	10.5		10.5	10.5		10.5	10.5		10.5
23.3	Telephone Costs	30		30	30		30	30		30	30		30	30		30
23.3	ADP Software Leases			0			0	0		0			0			0
23.3	ADP Hardware Lease			0			0			0			0			0
23.3	Commercial Time Sharing			0			0			0			0			0
23.3	Postal Fees (Other than APO Mail)			0			0			0			0			0
23.3	Other Mail Service Costs	1		1	1		1	1		1	1		1	1		1
23.3	Courier Services	2.3		2.3	2.3		2.3	2.3		2.3	2.3		2.3	2.3		2.3
	Subtotal OC 23.3	50.8	0	50.8	52.8	0	52.8	52.8	0	52.8	52.8	0	52.8	52.8	0	52.8
24	Printing and Reproduction	4.5		4.5	0		0	0		0	0		0	0		0
	Subtotal OC 24.0	4.5	0	4.5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
25.1	Advisory and assistance services	Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line		
25.1	Studies, Analyses, & Evaluations			0			0			0			0			0
25.1	Management & Professional Support Services			0			0			0			0			0
25.1	Engineering & Technical Services			0			0			0			0			0
	Subtotal OC 25.1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Code	Description															
25.2	Other services	Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line		
25.2	Office Security Guards	11.3		11.3	11.3		11.3	11.3		11.3	11.3		11.3	11.3		11.3
25.2	Residential Security Guard Services	18		18	18		18	18		18	18		18	18		18
25.2	Official Residential Expenses			0			0			0			0			0
25.2	Representation Allowances	0		0	0		0	0		0	0		0	0		0
25.2	Non-Federal Audits			0			0			0			0			0
25.2	Grievances/Investigations			0			0			0			0			0
25.2	Insurance and Vehicle Registration Fees			0			0			0			0			0
25.2	Vehicle Rental			0			0			0			0			0
25.2	Manpower Contracts			0			0			0			0			0
25.2	Records Declassification & Other Records Services			0			0			0			0			0
25.2	Recruiting activities			0			0			0			0			0
25.2	Penalty Interest Payments			0			0			0			0			0
25.2	Other Miscellaneous Services	12.6		12.6	20		20	20		20	12.6		12.6	12.6		12.6
25.2	Staff training contracts	49.9		49.9	59.9		59.9	59.9		59.9	71.8		71.8	71.8		71.8
25.2	ADP related contracts			0			0			0			0			0
	Subtotal OC 25.2	91.8	0	91.8	109.2	0	109.2	109.2	0	109.2	113.7	0	113.7	113.7	0	113.7
25.3	Purchase of goods and services from Government accoun	Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line		
25.3	ICASS	29.9		29.9	32.7		32.7	32.7		32.7	32.7		32.7	32.7		32.7
25.3	All Other Services from Other Gov't. accounts			0			0			0			0			0
	Subtotal OC 25.3	29.9	0	29.9	32.7	0	32.7	32.7	0	32.7	32.7	0	32.7	32.7	0	32.7
25.4	Operation and maintenance of facilities	Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line		
25.4	Office building Maintenance	3.8		3.8	3.8		3.8	5.6		5.6	3.8		3.8	7.5		7.5
25.4	Residential Building Maintenance	10		10	10.5		10.5	10.5		10.5	12.6		12.6	12.6		12.6
	Subtotal OC 25.4	13.8	0	13.8	14.3	0	14.3	16.1	0	16.1	16.4	0	16.4	20.1	0	20.1
25.6	Medical Care			0			0			0			0			0
	Subtotal OC 25.6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
25.7	Operation/maintenance of equipment & storage of goods	Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line		
25.7	ADP and telephone operation and maintenance costs			0			0			0			0			0
25.7	Storage Services			0			0			0			0			0
25.7	Office Furniture/Equip. Repair and Maintenance	7.5		7.5	8.3		8.3	8.3		8.3	7.5		7.5	9		9
25.7	Vehicle Repair and Maintenance	3.8		3.8	3.8		3.8	6		6	3.8		3.8	5		5
25.7	Residential Furniture/Equip. Repair and Maintenance	3.3		3.3	3.3		3.3	3.3		3.3	3.3		3.3	3.3		3.3
	Subtotal OC 25.7	14.6	0	14.6	15.4	0	15.4	17.6	0	17.6	14.6	0	14.6	17.3	0	17.3
25.8	Subsistance and support of persons (by contract or Gov't.)			0			0			0			0			0
	Subtotal OC 25.8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
26	Supplies and materials	45.6		45.6	46.8		46.8	46.8		46.8	46.8		46.8	46.8		46.8
	Subtotal OC 26.0	45.6	0	45.6	46.8	0	46.8	46.8	0	46.8	46.8	0	46.8	46.8	0	46.8
31	Equipment	Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line		
31	Purchase of Residential Furniture/Equip.	7.8		7.8	7.8		7.8	7.8		7.8	0		0	7.8		7.8
31	Purchase of Office Furniture/Equip.	15		15	11.3		11.3	11.3		11.3	7.5		7.5	11.3		11.3
31	Purchase of Vehicles	7.5		7.5	5		5	5		5	0		0	0		0
31	Purchase of Printing/Graphics Equipment			0			0			0			0			0

31	ADP Hardware purchases	20.5		20.5	10.4		10.4	71.7		71.7	10.4		10.4	10.4		10.4
31	ADP Software purchases	20.5		20.5	10.4		10.4	10.4		10.4	10.4		10.4	10.4		10.4
	Subtotal OC 31.0	71.3	0	71.3	44.9	0	44.9	106.2	0	106.2	28.3	0	28.3	39.9	0	39.9
32	Lands and structures	Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line		
32	Purchase of Land & Buildings (& construction of bldgs	1.1		1.1	0		0	0		0	0		0	0		0
32	Purchase of fixed equipment for buildings			0			0			0			0			0
32	Building Renovations/Alterations - Office			0			0			0			0			0
32	Building Renovations/Alterations - Residential			0			0			0			0			0
	Subtotal OC 32.0	1.1	0	1.1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
42	Claims and indemnities			0			0			0			0			0
	Subtotal OC 42.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	TOTAL BUDGET	1666.8	0	1666.8	1514.1	0	1514.1	1579.6	0	1579.6	1559.7	0	1559.7	1555.4	0	1555.4
	Dollars Used for Local Currency Purchases	1108.9			1171.9			1162			1225.9			1232.3		
	Exchange Rate Used in Computations	KS60.0	_____		KS60.0	_____		KS60.0	_____		KS60.0	_____		KS60.0	_____	
	Workyears of Effort 1/															
	FNDH	1		1	1		1			1	1		1			1
	FN PSCs	34		34	34		34			34	34		34			34
	IPAs/Details-In	0		0	0		0			0	0		0			0
	Manpower Contracts	0		0	0		0			0	0		0			0
	Total Workyears	35	0	35	35	0	35	0	0	35	35	0	35	0	0	35

1/ One workyear of effort is equal to 2080 hours worked.

Operating Expenses

<table>
<tr><td colspan="2">Org. Title: REDSO EA</td><td colspan="15">Overseas Mission Budgets</td></tr>
<tr><td>Org. No:</td><td style="text-align:center">623</td><td colspan="3" style="text-align:center">FY 1998</td><td colspan="3" style="text-align:center">FY 1999 Target</td><td colspan="3" style="text-align:center">FY 1999 Request</td><td colspan="3" style="text-align:center">FY 2000 Target</td><td colspan="3" style="text-align:center">FY 2000 Request</td></tr>
<tr><td>OC</td><td></td><td>Dollars</td><td>TF</td><td>Total</td><td>Dollars</td><td>TF</td><td>Total</td><td>Dollars</td><td>TF</td><td>Total</td><td>Dollars</td><td>TF</td><td>Total</td><td>Dollars</td><td>TF</td><td>Total</td></tr>
<tr><td>11.1</td><td>Base Pay & pymt. for annual leave balances - FNDH</td><td>40.1</td><td></td><td>40.1</td><td>42.6</td><td></td><td>42.6</td><td>42.6</td><td></td><td>42.6</td><td>48.5</td><td></td><td>48.5</td><td>48.5</td><td></td><td>48.5</td></tr>
<tr><td></td><td>Subtotal OC 11.1</td><td>40.1</td><td>0</td><td>40.1</td><td>42.6</td><td>0</td><td>42.6</td><td>42.6</td><td>0</td><td>42.6</td><td>48.5</td><td>0</td><td>48.5</td><td>48.5</td><td>0</td><td>48.5</td></tr>
<tr><td>11.3</td><td>Personnel comp. - other than full-time permanent</td><td colspan="3" style="text-align:center">Do not enter data on this line</td><td colspan="3" style="text-align:center">Do not enter data on this line</td><td colspan="3" style="text-align:center">Do not enter data on this line</td><td colspan="3" style="text-align:center">Do not enter data on this line</td><td colspan="3" style="text-align:center">Do not enter data on this line</td></tr>
<tr><td>11.3</td><td>Base Pay & pymt. for annual leave balances - FNDH</td><td></td><td></td><td>0</td><td></td><td></td><td>0</td><td></td><td></td><td>0</td><td></td><td></td><td>0</td><td></td><td></td><td>0</td></tr>
<tr><td></td><td>Subtotal OC 11.3</td><td>0</td><td>0</td><td>0</td><td>0</td><td>0</td><td>0</td><td>0</td><td>0</td><td>0</td><td>0</td><td>0</td><td>0</td><td>0</td><td>0</td><td>0</td></tr>
<tr><td>11.5</td><td>Other personnel compensation</td><td colspan="3" style="text-align:center">Do not enter data on this line</td><td colspan="3" style="text-align:center">Do not enter data on this line</td><td colspan="3" style="text-align:center">Do not enter data on this line</td><td colspan="3" style="text-align:center">Do not enter data on this line</td><td colspan="3" style="text-align:center">Do not enter data on this line</td></tr>
<tr><td>11.5</td><td>USDH</td><td></td><td></td><td>0</td><td></td><td></td><td>0</td><td></td><td></td><td>0</td><td></td><td></td><td>0</td><td></td><td></td><td>0</td></tr>
<tr><td>11.5</td><td>FNDH</td><td></td><td></td><td>0</td><td></td><td></td><td>0</td><td></td><td></td><td>0</td><td></td><td></td><td>0</td><td></td><td></td><td>0</td></tr>
<tr><td></td><td>Subtotal OC 11.5</td><td>0</td><td>0</td><td>0</td><td>0</td><td>0</td><td>0</td><td>0</td><td>0</td><td>0</td><td>0</td><td>0</td><td>0</td><td>0</td><td>0</td><td>0</td></tr>
<tr><td>11.8</td><td>Special personal services payments</td><td colspan="3" style="text-align:center">Do not enter data on this line</td><td colspan="3" style="text-align:center">Do not enter data on this line</td><td colspan="3" style="text-align:center">Do not enter data on this line</td><td colspan="3" style="text-align:center">Do not enter data on this line</td><td colspan="3" style="text-align:center">Do not enter data on this line</td></tr>
<tr><td>11.8</td><td>USPSC Salaries</td><td>251.1</td><td></td><td>251.1</td><td>130.3</td><td></td><td>130.3</td><td>130.3</td><td></td><td>130.3</td><td>105.7</td><td></td><td>105.7</td><td>105.7</td><td></td><td>105.7</td></tr>
<tr><td>11.8</td><td>FN PSC Salaries</td><td>1003.7</td><td></td><td>1003.7</td><td>1054.2</td><td></td><td>1054.2</td><td>1054.2</td><td></td><td>1054.2</td><td>1107.2</td><td></td><td>1107.2</td><td>1107.2</td><td></td><td>1107.2</td></tr>
<tr><td>11.8</td><td>IPA/Details-In/PASAs/RSSAs Salaries</td><td></td><td></td><td>0</td><td></td><td></td><td>0</td><td></td><td></td><td>0</td><td></td><td></td><td>0</td><td></td><td></td><td>0</td></tr>
<tr><td></td><td>Subtotal OC 11.8</td><td>1254.8</td><td>0</td><td>1254.8</td><td>1184.5</td><td>0</td><td>1184.5</td><td>1184.5</td><td>0</td><td>1184.5</td><td>1212.9</td><td>0</td><td>1212.9</td><td>1212.9</td><td>0</td><td>1212.9</td></tr>
<tr><td>12.1</td><td>Personnel benefits</td><td colspan="3" style="text-align:center">Do not enter data on this line</td><td colspan="3" style="text-align:center">Do not enter data on this line</td><td colspan="3" style="text-align:center">Do not enter data on this line</td><td colspan="3" style="text-align:center">Do not enter data on this line</td><td colspan="3" style="text-align:center">Do not enter data on this line</td></tr>
<tr><td>12.1</td><td>USDH benefits</td><td colspan="3" style="text-align:center">Do not enter data on this line</td><td colspan="3" style="text-align:center">Do not enter data on this line</td><td colspan="3" style="text-align:center">Do not enter data on this line</td><td colspan="3" style="text-align:center">Do not enter data on this line</td><td colspan="3" style="text-align:center">Do not enter data on this line</td></tr>
<tr><td>12.1</td><td>Educational Allowances</td><td>360.3</td><td></td><td>360.3</td><td>409.9</td><td></td><td>409.9</td><td>474.7</td><td></td><td>474.7</td><td>486.3</td><td></td><td>486.3</td><td>541.9</td><td></td><td>541.9</td></tr>
<tr><td>12.1</td><td>Cost of Living Allowances</td><td>70.3</td><td></td><td>70.3</td><td>69.2</td><td></td><td>69.2</td><td>73.1</td><td></td><td>73.1</td><td>71.3</td><td></td><td>71.3</td><td>75.3</td><td></td><td>75.3</td></tr>
<tr><td>12.1</td><td>Home Service Transfer Allowances</td><td>8.3</td><td></td><td>8.3</td><td>4.8</td><td></td><td>4.8</td><td>8.6</td><td></td><td>8.6</td><td>11.4</td><td></td><td>11.4</td><td>11.4</td><td></td><td>11.4</td></tr>
<tr><td>12.1</td><td>Quarters Allowances</td><td></td><td></td><td>0</td><td></td><td></td><td>0</td><td></td><td></td><td>0</td><td></td><td></td><td>0</td><td></td><td></td><td>0</td></tr>
<tr><td>12.1</td><td>Other Misc. USDH Benefits</td><td>28.6</td><td></td><td>28.6</td><td>38</td><td></td><td>38</td><td>38</td><td></td><td>38</td><td>38</td><td></td><td>38</td><td>38</td><td></td><td>38</td></tr>
<tr><td>12.1</td><td>FNDH Benefits</td><td colspan="3" style="text-align:center">Do not enter data on this line</td><td colspan="3" style="text-align:center">Do not enter data on this line</td><td colspan="3" style="text-align:center">Do not enter data on this line</td><td colspan="3" style="text-align:center">Do not enter data on this line</td><td colspan="3" style="text-align:center">Do not enter data on this line</td></tr>
<tr><td>12.1</td><td>Payments to the FSN Separation Fund - FNDH</td><td></td><td></td><td>0</td><td></td><td></td><td>0</td><td></td><td></td><td>0</td><td></td><td></td><td>0</td><td></td><td></td><td>0</td></tr>
<tr><td>12.1</td><td>Other FNDH Benefits</td><td>12.8</td><td></td><td>12.8</td><td>13.9</td><td></td><td>13.9</td><td>13.9</td><td></td><td>13.9</td><td>13.9</td><td></td><td>13.9</td><td>13.9</td><td></td><td>13.9</td></tr>
<tr><td>12.1</td><td>US PSC Benefits</td><td></td><td></td><td>0</td><td></td><td></td><td>0</td><td></td><td></td><td>0</td><td></td><td></td><td>0</td><td></td><td></td><td>0</td></tr>
<tr><td>12.1</td><td>FN PSC Benefits</td><td colspan="3" style="text-align:center">Do not enter data on this line</td><td colspan="3" style="text-align:center">Do not enter data on this line</td><td colspan="3" style="text-align:center">Do not enter data on this line</td><td colspan="3" style="text-align:center">Do not enter data on this line</td><td colspan="3" style="text-align:center">Do not enter data on this line</td></tr>
<tr><td>12.1</td><td>Payments to the FSN Separation Fund - FN PSC</td><td></td><td></td><td>0</td><td></td><td></td><td>0</td><td></td><td></td><td>0</td><td></td><td></td><td>0</td><td></td><td></td><td>0</td></tr>
<tr><td>12.1</td><td>Other FN PSC Benefits</td><td>215.7</td><td></td><td>215.7</td><td>225.9</td><td></td><td>225.9</td><td>225.9</td><td></td><td>225.9</td><td>224</td><td></td><td>224</td><td>225.9</td><td></td><td>225.9</td></tr>
<tr><td>12.1</td><td>IPA/Detail-In/PASA/RSSA Benefits</td><td></td><td></td><td>0</td><td></td><td></td><td>0</td><td></td><td></td><td>0</td><td></td><td></td><td>0</td><td></td><td></td><td>0</td></tr>
<tr><td></td><td>Subtotal OC 12.1</td><td>696</td><td>0</td><td>696</td><td>761.7</td><td>0</td><td>761.7</td><td>834.2</td><td>0</td><td>834.2</td><td>844.9</td><td>0</td><td>844.9</td><td>906.4</td><td>0</td><td>906.4</td></tr>
<tr><td>13</td><td>Benefits for former personnel</td><td colspan="3" style="text-align:center">Do not enter data on this line</td><td colspan="3" style="text-align:center">Do not enter data on this line</td><td colspan="3" style="text-align:center">Do not enter data on this line</td><td colspan="3" style="text-align:center">Do not enter data on this line</td><td colspan="3" style="text-align:center">Do not enter data on this line</td></tr>
<tr><td>13</td><td>FNDH</td><td colspan="3" style="text-align:center">Do not enter data on this line</td><td colspan="3" style="text-align:center">Do not enter data on this line</td><td colspan="3" style="text-align:center">Do not enter data on this line</td><td colspan="3" style="text-align:center">Do not enter data on this line</td><td colspan="3" style="text-align:center">Do not enter data on this line</td></tr>
<tr><td>13</td><td>Severance Payments for FNDH</td><td></td><td></td><td>0</td><td></td><td></td><td>0</td><td></td><td></td><td>0</td><td></td><td></td><td>0</td><td></td><td></td><td>0</td></tr>
<tr><td>13</td><td>Other Benefits for Former Personnel - FNDH</td><td></td><td></td><td>0</td><td></td><td></td><td>0</td><td></td><td></td><td>0</td><td></td><td></td><td>0</td><td></td><td></td><td>0</td></tr>
<tr><td>13</td><td>FN PSCs</td><td colspan="3" style="text-align:center">Do not enter data on this line</td><td colspan="3" style="text-align:center">Do not enter data on this line</td><td colspan="3" style="text-align:center">Do not enter data on this line</td><td colspan="3" style="text-align:center">Do not enter data on this line</td><td colspan="3" style="text-align:center">Do not enter data on this line</td></tr>
<tr><td>13</td><td>Severance Payments for FN PSCs</td><td></td><td></td><td>0</td><td></td><td></td><td>0</td><td></td><td></td><td>0</td><td></td><td></td><td>0</td><td></td><td></td><td>0</td></tr>
<tr><td>13</td><td>Other Benefits for Former Personnel - FN PSCs</td><td></td><td></td><td>0</td><td></td><td></td><td>0</td><td></td><td></td><td>0</td><td></td><td></td><td>0</td><td></td><td></td><td>0</td></tr>
</table>

oe-21623.wk4

Operating Expenses

	Subtotal OC 13.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
21	Travel and transportation of persons	Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line		
21	Training Travel	30.8		30.8	30.8		30.8	30.8		30.8	30.8		30.8	30.8		30.8
21	Mandatory/Statutory Travel	Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line		
21	Post Assignment Travel - to field	42.5		42.5	25		25	45		45	60		60	60		60
21	Assignment to Washington Travel	15		15	0		0	0		0	0		0	0		0
21	Home Leave Travel	65.4		65.4	90		90	90		90	86		86	86		86
21	R & R Travel	75		75	85		85	85		85	70.3		70.3	90.3		90.3
21	Education Travel	25.2		25.2	12.8		12.8	12.8		12.8	12.8		12.8	12.8		12.8
21	Evacuation Travel	20.8		20.8	20.8		20.8	25.6		25.6	10.4		10.4	25.6		25.6
21	Retirement Travel	0		0	0		0	0		0	0		0	0		0
21	Pre-Employment Invitational Travel			0			0			0			0			0
21	Other Mandatory/Statutory Travel			0			0			0			0			0
21	Operational Travel	Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line		
21	Site Visits - Headquarters Personnel	38.4		38.4	38.4		38.4	53		53	0		0	53		53
21	Site Visits - Mission Personnel	446.7		446.7	495.3		495.3	495.3		495.3	421.5		421.5	495.3		495.3
21	Conferences/Seminars/Meetings/Retreats	108.4		108.4	119.5		119.5	119.5		119.5	100.6		100.6	125.6		125.6
21	Assessment Travel			0			0			0			0			0
21	Impact Evaluation Travel			0			0			0			0			0
21	Disaster Travel (to respond to specific disasters)			0			0			0			0			0
21	Recruitment Travel			0			0			0			0			0
21	Other Operational Travel	9.6		9.6	9.6		9.6	9.6		9.6	9.6		9.6	9.6		9.6
	Subtotal OC 21.0	877.8	0	877.8	927.2	0	927.2	966.6	0	966.6	802	0	802	989	0	989
22	Transportation of things	Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line		
22	Post assignment freight	152.2		152.2	98.6		98.6	162.2		162.2	190.8		190.8	190.8		190.8
22	Home Leave Freight	129.6		129.6	223.6		223.6	223.6		223.6	210.4		210.4	210.4		210.4
22	Retirement Freight	0		0	0		0	0		0	0		0	0		0
22	Transportation/Freight for Office Furniture/Equip.	52.5		52.5	30		30	60		60	30		30	75		75
22	Transportation/Freight for Res. Furniture/Equip.	27		27	15		15	30		30			0	45		45
	Subtotal OC 22.0	361.3	0	361.3	367.2	0	367.2	475.8	0	475.8	431.2	0	431.2	521.2	0	521.2
23.2	Rental payments to others	Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line		
23.2	Rental Payments to Others - Office Space	186.2		186.2	188.5		188.5	188.5		188.5	216.8		216.8	216.8		216.8
23.2	Rental Payments to Others - Warehouse Space	13.8		13.8	13.9		13.9	13.9		13.9	16.1		16.1	16.1		16.1
23.2	Rental Payments to Others - Residences	423.6		423.6	413.4		413.4	466.2		466.2	441.8		441.8	496.4		496.4
	Subtotal OC 23.2	623.6	0	623.6	615.8	0	615.8	668.6	0	668.6	674.7	0	674.7	729.3	0	729.3
23.3	Communications, utilities, and miscellaneous charges	Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line		
23.3	Office Utilities	30		30	36		36	36		36	36		36	36		36
23.3	Residential Utilities	77		77	73.5		73.5	84		84	73.5		73.5	96.6		96.6
23.3	Telephone Costs	120		120	120		120	120		120	120		120	120		120
23.3	ADP Software Leases			0			0			0			0			0
23.3	ADP Hardware Lease			0			0			0			0			0
23.3	Commercial Time Sharing			0			0			0			0			0
23.3	Postal Fees (Other than APO Mail)			0			0			0			0			0

oe-21623.wk4

Code	Description															
23.3	Other Mail Service Costs	3		3	3		3	3		3	3		3	3		3
23.3	Courier Services	9		9	9		9	9		9	9		9	9		9
	Subtotal OC 23.3	239	0	239	241.5	0	241.5	252	0	252	241.5	0	241.5	264.6	0	264.6
24	Printing and Reproduction	8.9		8.9	0		0	0		0	0		0	0		0
	Subtotal OC 24.0	8.9	0	8.9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
25.1	Advisory and assistance services	Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line		
25.1	Studies, Analyses, & Evaluations			0			0			0			0			0
25.1	Management & Professional Support Services			0			0			0			0			0
25.1	Engineering & Technical Services			0			0			0			0			0
	Subtotal OC 25.1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
25.2	Other services	Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line		
25.2	Office Security Guards	45		45	45		45	45		45	45		45	45		45
25.2	Residential Security Guard Services	138		138	126		126	144		144	126		126	144		144
25.2	Official Residential Expenses			0			0			0			0			0
25.2	Representation Allowances	2		2	2		2	2		2	2		2	2		2
25.2	Non-Federal Audits			0			0			0			0			0
25.2	Grievances/Investigations			0			0			0			0			0
25.2	Insurance and Vehicle Registration Fees			0			0			0			0			0
25.2	Vehicle Rental			0			0			0			0			0
25.2	Manpower Contracts			0			0			0			0			0
25.2	Records Declassification & Other Records Services			0			0			0			0			0
25.2	Recruiting activities			0			0			0			0			0
25.2	Penalty Interest Payments			0			0			0			0			0
25.2	Other Miscellaneous Services	60		60	74.7		74.7	74.7		74.7	60		60	66.8		66.8
25.2	Staff training contracts	73.9		73.9	88.7		88.7	88.7		88.7	86.2		86.2	88.7		88.7
25.2	ADP related contracts			0			0			0			0			0
	Subtotal OC 25.2	318.9	0	318.9	336.4	0	336.4	354.4	0	354.4	319.2	0	319.2	346.5	0	346.5
25.3	Purchase of goods and services from Government acco	Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line		
25.3	ICASS	228.9		228.9	228.9		228.9	228.9		228.9	228.9		228.9	228.9		228.9
25.3	All Other Services from Other Gov't. accounts			0			0			0			0			0
	Subtotal OC 25.3	228.9	0	228.9	228.9	0	228.9	228.9	0	228.9	228.9	0	228.9	228.9	0	228.9
25.4	Operation and maintenance of facilities	Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line		
25.4	Office building Maintenance	15		15	15		15	22.5		22.5	15		15	30		30
25.4	Residential Building Maintenance	80		80	80		80	84		84	80		80	84		84
	Subtotal OC 25.4	95	0	95	95	0	95	106.5	0	106.5	95	0	95	114	0	114
25.6	Medical Care			0			0			0			0			0
	Subtotal OC 25.6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
25.7	Operation/maintenance of equipment & storage of goo	Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line		

Operating Expenses

25.7	ADP and telephone operation and maintenance costs		0			0			0			0			0
25.7	Storage Services		0			0			0			0			0
25.7	Office Furniture/Equip. Repair and Maintenance	30	30	33		33	33		33	30		30	36		36
25.7	Vehicle Repair and Maintenance	15	15	15		15	18		18	15		15	20		20
25.7	Residential Furniture/Equip. Repair and Maintenance	25.1	25.1	25.1		25.1	25.1		25.1	25.1		25.1	25.1		25.1
	Subtotal OC 25.7	70.1	0	70.1	73.1	0	73.1	76.1	0	76.1	70.1	0	70.1	81.1	0	81.1
25.8	Subsistance and support of persons (by contract or Gov't.)		0			0			0			0			0
	Subtotal OC 25.8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
26	Supplies and materials	90	90	90		90	90		90	90		90	90		90
	Subtotal OC 26.0	90	0	90	90	0	90	90	0	90	90	0	90	90	0	90
31	Equipment	Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line	
31	Purchase of Residential Furniture/Equip.	60	60	60		60	60		60	0		0	60		60
31	Purchase of Office Furniture/Equip.	60	60	45		45	45		45	30		30	45		45
31	Purchase of Vehicles	30	30	20		20	20		20	0		0	0		0
31	Purchase of Printing/Graphics Equipment		0			0			0			0			0
31	ADP Hardware purchases	30	30	15		15	105		105	15		15	15		15
31	ADP Software purchases	30	30	15		15	15		15	15		15	15		15
	Subtotal OC 31.0	210	0	210	155	0	155	245	0	245	60	0	60	135	0	135
32	Lands and structures	Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line	
32	Purchase of Land & Buildings (& construction of bld	4.5	4.5	0		0	0		0	0		0	0		0
32	Purchase of fixed equipment for buildings		0			0			0			0			0
32	Building Renovations/Alterations - Office		0			0			0			0			0
32	Building Renovations/Alterations - Residential		0			0			0			0			0
	Subtotal OC 32.0	4.5	0	4.5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
42	Claims and indemnities		0			0			0			0			0
	Subtotal OC 42.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	TOTAL BUDGET	5118.9	0	5118.9	5118.9	0	5118.9	5525.2	0	5525.2	5118.9	0	5118.9	5667.4	0	5667.4
	Dollars Used for Local Currency Purchases	2674.4			2749.9			2832.2			2769.2			2969		
	Exchange Rate Used in Computations	KS60.0			KS60.0			KS60.0			KS60.0			KS60.0		
	Workyears of Effort 1/															
	FNDH		1			1						1			
	FN PSCs		56			56						56			
	IPAs/Details-In		0			0						0			
	Manpower Contracts		0			0						0			
	Total Workyears	0	0	57	0	0	57	0	0	0	0	0	57	0	0	0

oe-21623.wk4

1/ One workyear of effort is equal to 2080 hours worked.